

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IT is a trying experience for any man to be anticipated. Captain Scott and his companions had it, and felt it. Dr. C. J. BALL has had it, and doubtless feels it too. For many years he has been occupied in the preparation of a Commentary on *The Book of Job*. Last year a great Commentary on the same Book came from two distinguished scholars, Driver and Buchanan Gray. Only now has Dr. BALL been able to publish his book (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 25s. net).

It must be a trying experience. But, unlike Scott and his companions, Dr. BALL will survive it. His Commentary is a scholar's work and independent. In one respect it is alone. Dr. BALL has a knowledge of the languages cognate to Hebrew which (as Dr. BURNEY in the Preface assures us) is unique both in breadth and in depth; and on that knowledge he draws freely. The result is (to quote Dr. BURNEY again) that 'Dr. Ball's volume is not merely a commentary on the text of Job. It is a storehouse of material for the enrichment of the Hebrew Lexicon. This results, in the main, from his profound knowledge of the Babylonian language—a knowledge which is essential to progress in Hebrew studies, but in which the great majority of our professed Old Testament students are unfortunately lacking. In the present work the supreme value of such know-

ledge is illustrated by the writer's masterly translation and discussion of the text of "the Babylonian Job."

We turn at once to the great testing passage in the nineteenth chapter. Dr. BALL traces the hope of resurrection in the three famous verses, 25-27, to the Latin translation of St. Jerome. He quotes that translation. The first two lines are:

Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit,
Et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum.

The momentous line is the second. Where did St. Jerome get it? Dr. BALL does not think that he got it from a different Hebrew text. He considers it probable that the *first person* was a guess of his own, based on the fact that the following lines are all in the first person except the last, and that then he emended the text and brought it into agreement.

Dr. BALL finds no thought of a resurrection, personal or national, in the poem. One thing he finds and one only—Job's certainty that he shall yet 'see God.' For he must see God, in order that the friends' unfriendly charges may be refuted. But when does he wish to see Him? Not in the hereafter. That is not in all his thoughts. Here, now, on the earth, sooner or later—that is his assurance.

And he had his desire. When at last God interfered it was that Job might see Him and that his friends might be confounded. '*Iahvah answered Eyob* (we accept Dr. BALL's spelling) *out of the storm-wind*—an immediate physical manifestation. We are left in no doubt about it by Eyob's own words, which surely were not written without intentional reference to the present passage: *I had heard of Thee by hearsay; But now my own eye hath seen Thee!*'

'Eyob's prophecy, then, finds its fulfilment within the limits of the poem itself. He is not represented as looking forward to the establishment of his innocence after he had passed out of the body into the dim world of the dead ("after death, apart from the flesh"); much less is he anticipating his own resurrection from the dead at the Last Day. He simply declares his unalterable conviction that Iahvah, the God of righteous Retribution, will appear to right his lamentable wrongs in the present life, before his disease has run its fatal course.'

When Dr. BALL has corrected the text this is the translation:

For I, I know my Avenger;
And at last He will rise up on earth;
I shall see, while I yet live, El's revenges,
And in my flesh I shall gaze on Eloah!
I shall behold Him and not Another,
And mine eyes will look on Him, and not a
strange god!
My kidneys are wasted with my waiting
(Until my hope shall come).

How is it that a phrase so characteristic of the Gospels as 'the Kingdom of God' has found no place in our modern speech? Is it because the idea is difficult to grasp? It is difficult. And yet we are sure that it ought not to be difficult. We come upon it constantly and every time we come upon it we expect to understand it. But every time it escapes us.

Is it the translation that is at fault? Other translations have been tried. A recent writer on the Kingdom of God used 'the Realm of God' throughout his book. That word may meet the republican objection to kings and kingdoms, but it does not make the phrase more intelligible.

Dr. H. St. John THACKERAY has a hint in his Schweich Lectures. The Schweich Lectures for 1920 dealt with *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Humphrey Milford; 6s. net). In the course of the lecture on Septuagint Origins, Dr. THACKERAY touches on the titles of the books in the Bible. In English we have four books which we call First and Second Samuel, First and Second Kings. In Hebrew there are but two, Samuel and Kings. In the Septuagint there is but one.

It is the usual Greek word for 'kingdoms.' And so it is usually translated — 'The Book of Kingdoms.' But what kingdoms? The two kingdoms of Judah and Israel is the answer usually given. Dr. THACKERAY does not accept it. If 'Kings' was to the Alexandrian translators an inappropriate title, 'Kingdoms' would have been more inappropriate. For the book is more than half done before the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel come into existence. That is not the meaning of the word.

The meaning of the word is 'Reigns.' It had that meaning in Hellenistic Greek. 'The Book of the Reigns'—that, Dr. THACKERAY believes, is the title given in the Septuagint to our Books of Samuel and Kings. It is a good descriptive title.

Take the word into the New Testament. It is Hellenistic Greek we have to do with there. 'The Reign of God is at hand'—that is intelligible enough. It is true that in St. Matthew's Gospel the phrase is 'the Reign of Heaven.' But that offers no difficulty. We know that in their excessive zeal for the honour of God the Jews refused to pronounce His name, and used such expressions as 'Heaven' or even 'Place' instead of it. In a Gospel

addressed to Jews such a phrase as 'the Reign of Heaven' would be more easily understood and more readily appreciated than 'the Reign of God.'

Let us try 'the Reign of God,' then. Let us try it in the most uncertain of all the places where the phrase occurs—Lk 17²¹. The Revised Version has 'The kingdom of God is within you' in the text, and 'The kingdom of God is in the midst of you' in the margin. Either way it is not easy to understand. How can a kingdom be within us or among us? But the reign of God can be within us, and the reign of God can be in the midst of us.

'It is undeniable that, in reading some passages in the Gospels, such as the concluding sentences of the parables of judgment, or the terrible woes denounced against the Pharisees in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew's Gospel or against the unrepentant cities, or the other references to future judgment and punishment, we feel almost as if the old order of retributive justice were still in force and must have been accepted by Jesus. We read of "the unprofitable servant" being "cast into the outer darkness," where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxv. 30, cp. Luke xix. 27), of "the tares" being "gathered and cast into the fire" (Matt. xiii. 40 ff.), of the servant who was careless and unprepared being "beaten with many stripes" (Luke xii. 47), of the unmerciful servant "being delivered to the tormentors" (Matt. xviii. 34), of the Lord of the vineyard "miserably destroying those wicked men," and letting out the vineyard to others (Matt. xxi. 41), and of the "age-long" punishment which awaits the wicked (Matt. xxv. 46).'

'This severe side of Jesus' teaching, with its insistence on judgment and the suffering that inevitably attends on sin, cannot be set aside or explained away, but must be honestly faced.'

'Perhaps the most striking expression of it, and

the one most difficult to reconcile with the teaching concerning the deeper, more personal justice of love, is the passage in Matt. xxiii. denouncing woes against the Scribes and Pharisees. The words here cut like a Russian knout. There is in them a note of contempt and bitter invective which gives the reader a moral jar as coming from the lips of Him who said "Love your enemies." Words such as "ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves," "ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?" are, to say the least of it, not altogether easy to harmonise with the general spirit of the teaching or with the central thought of Jesus concerning God and man.'

Those three paragraphs are found in a book on *Christian Justice* (Swarthmore Press; 6s. 6d. net). The very title tells us that it is a modern book. For 'justice' is an attempt to make the old word 'righteousness' acceptable to the modern mind. It is that same modern mind that is disturbed over the 'harsh' sayings of our Lord, and is looking so earnestly for a way round them. The author of this book is a young Presbyterian minister, trained at Westminster College, Cambridge, the Rev. Norman L. ROBINSON, M.A. He is more than disturbed, he is distressed about these sayings. What does he propose to do with them?

He must do something with them. For he has just been demonstrating the unquenchable love of God to men, the unrestricted offer of His favour. Who revealed that love? Who made that offer? The self-same Jesus who called the Pharisees 'offspring of vipers.' But Mr. ROBINSON cannot believe that one and the same Jesus could have said to the adulterous woman, 'Neither do I condemn thee,' and to the righteous Pharisees, 'How shall ye escape the judgment of hell?' He accepts the one set of sayings and endeavours to get rid of the other.

First of all, he recommends a more exact translation. And that at any rate is good recommenda-

tion. But the only example he gives does not carry far. The words usually translated 'Woe unto you!' he says, would be better to be rendered 'Alas for you!'

More serious is the fact, and it is a fact, that 'certain of the harshest passages' do not occur in St. Luke; they occur only in St. Matthew. Now St. Matthew, says Mr. ROBINSON, 'had a strong anti-Pharisaic bias.' He thinks, therefore, that these passages may possibly be the First Evangelist's own. Jesus did not utter them. What He said of Jerusalem, where the Pharisees were, and so by implication of the Pharisees, was this: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!'

Well, if the harsh passages, or even the harshest of them, are due to an anti-Pharisaic evangelist, the matter is settled. We have simply to leave them out. We have simply to take Jesus without them. But are they?

Mr. ROBINSON does not really believe that they are. He owes the suggestion to a friend, and leaves the responsibility with him. All that he himself will say is that 'the tone of the original utterance has not been quite caught by the First Evangelist.' He looks round for another explanation.

He tries more than one. He refers to the suggestion that 'it is Pharisaism rather than the Pharisees that Jesus is here gibbeting.' He refers to it and passes on.

He notices that, apart from the denunciation of the Pharisees, the severe sayings of Jesus are found in His parables. Now 'many of the parables of judgment have a national rather than an individual reference, as, for example, the parable of the Vineyard, and of the Fig-tree, also the parable

of the Pounds, and of the marriage of the King's son, which clearly refer to the doom impending on the Jewish nation,' Even 'in the case of the woes on the Pharisees, and on the cities of Galilee, and the lament over Jerusalem, judgment is pronounced on a class or a community rather than on individuals. It had become clear to Jesus that God's purpose of the Kingdom could not be realised through the Jewish nation or its leaders, but that He must build the new Israel on individuals devoted to Himself. The references to individual retribution are thus far fewer than is generally supposed.'

But that does not explain everything. The references to individual retribution and even rejection are undoubtedly there.

He finds relief at last in an eschatological suggestion. The rejection is not for ever. It is only for 'the age,' the age then believed to be near its end, that final consummation to which all Jewish thought looked forward. 'Jesus used this traditional material, derived from the Old Testament and from the apocalyptists, in order to express the central truth He wished to bring home to men.'

'That truth was the unspeakable loss and suffering involved in the refusal to accept the rule of God the Father in the heart and in the world. What excluded men from the Kingdom was not sins of impulse, which, bringing with them, as they usually do, a speedy nemesis, leave the heart still open to good, so much as those deeper sins of disposition, impenitence, insincerity, the unforgiving spirit, which imply the closing of the heart against the appeal of truth and love. No language concerning the "outer darkness" or "the unquenchable fire" was too strong to express what was involved in this exclusion, this missing of life's supreme opportunity. It was the ultimate loss, than which there could be none greater. It was the missing of the "life which is life indeed," the refusal of the soul's true destiny. But the exclusion was self-exclusion. The loss was self-inflicted.

It was not the sentence of a judge imposed from without, but the inevitable consequence of shutting the heart to the light. "This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light."

Well, that is all true and well said. But does it meet the trouble? Does it explain the language of Jesus to the Pharisees? Does it remove the dread of the last awful judgment? If the Pharisees deliberately rejected the truth when they saw it, and sinned openly and ostentatiously against God, they may certainly be said to have loved darkness rather than light, and their exclusion may be called self-exclusion. But the question remains, Is the exclusion, for them or for any one else, final, or is it only for a time?

Mr. ROBINSON believes that it is only for a time. He returns to the teaching of Jesus. For 'though no one has the right dogmatically to deny the possibility of such final rejection of good, yet the teaching of Jesus can only be rightly understood when it is interpreted from a centre, and that centre the Fatherly love of God, as we see it manifested in His own life and Cross. It is hard to believe that such love can be finally defeated, that there are some souls which the Divine Lover, the Hound of Heaven, will never overtake, pursue them how He will. We cannot doubt that Paul was speaking by the spirit of Jesus, when he wrote of love that it "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," and that "it never faileth." Can we believe that the love, which was also the passion for justice, that went to the Cross and there prayed for the forgiveness of those who nailed Him there, could ever suffer final defeat? Would not such defeat of necessity mean eternal dissatisfaction and pain at the heart of God? If there be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, there must be pain over one sinner who, refusing to repent, is consigned to "the outer darkness."

Is it more than a generous desire? To say 'it

is hard to believe that such love can be finally defeated,' is that to say that no one will finally exclude himself? What of the will? Is the freedom of the will only for a time? Is God at last to work His will in spite of it?

Mr. ROBINSON says He is. The suggestion comes from a friend; but he accepts it. 'There is a sense in which truth may be said to be coercive, in the case where a man, in the course of God's Providential dealing with him, is shut up to only two alternatives, and the issue between light and darkness is so clearly set that there is no evading it. The Prodigal in Christ's parable is a good instance. For a long time he "resisted the truth in unrighteousness," but when he was reduced to extremity, to loneliness, penury, and the swine-trough, then truth laid its irresistible constraint upon him, and he "came to himself," and to his father. Experience brought him to a point where truth would take no denial. There was in a sense only one way left, the way home; and yet it had to be his own choice, he had to say, "I will arise and go." Sooner or later, in this way, by the reduction of alternatives, a man can be brought face to face with truth and love in such a way that he can do naught else but choose the truth.'

'Let him that stole, steal no more.'

But if he is a kleptomaniac? The question is asked by Dr. W. H. R. RIVERS. Dr. RIVERS, Fellow and Prælector in Natural Sciences in St. John's College, Cambridge, is an expert in psychoneurosis. He has issued a second edition of his book on *Instinct and the Unconscious* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 15s. net). The first edition was noticed here, and special attention was directed to the author's remarkable experiments in claustrophobia. To the new edition he has added two appendixes, in one of which he discusses 'the Instinct of Acquisition.' It is in that discussion that he asks the question, what if the thief is a kleptomaniac?

And he is entitled to ask it. For if he is a kleptomaniac he belongs to the company of those who have the instinct of acquisition, and may be no more blameworthy than the bird which secures the half-acre or more of ground for its own possession just before the breeding time. Dr. RIVERS begins with the bird.

‘The earliest phase in the process of mating and breeding in the lapwing, warblers and many other birds is the assumption of a special attitude on the part of the individual male bird. The male takes up a position from which he adopts an aggressive attitude towards any other male of the species which ventures within a region surrounding this position. The size of the territory over which individual ownership is thus assumed varies with different species and under different conditions, but is usually a half to several acres in extent. When the male bird has become master of his territory he is sought out by the female, and mating and breeding take place.’

There is a difference between the acquisitive bird and the kleptomaniac. The bird acquires its territory—just as much as will be necessary to furnish food for its young—at the mating time. After the young are reared the acquisitive instinct disappears. The combative bird is combative no longer. It returns to the peaceful society of its fellows. The kleptomaniac is a kleptomaniac all the year round.

That seems to be due to the fact that kleptomania is not merely an instinct. It is partly a modifiable inheritance. It may even be partly a social habit. Therein lies the hope for the kleptomaniac. Instinct is incurable. Hereditary taint and social disturbance are not.

But what is the Christian preacher to do? St. Paul was a preacher. ‘Steal no more,’ he said. The situation was simple; he dealt with it simply. But it is not so simple now. Psychology has come upon us. We see ourselves as others see

us. And when we see others we recognize instincts and impulses which modify our censure or even arrest our judgment. ‘Let him that stole, steal no more.’ Certainly. But if he cannot help it we must do more than lay commands upon him. We must watch over him and direct him. For kleptomania, the psychologist tells us, is not a sin. It is only a psychosis.

The most curious fact about the instinct of acquisition is that the bird is combative only when alone. When it returns to society it becomes peaceable again. It is the same with man.

Dr. RIVERS is an authority on the Melanesians. Now ‘throughout Melanesia we find a peculiar blend of individualistic and communistic behaviour in relation to property. In respect of all kinds of property the whole aspect of individual ownership is far less definite than among ourselves. Though certain objects, such as weapons or utensils which a man has himself made, are regarded by general consent as his individual property, there is far more common use of such individually owned articles than is customary in our society. With other objects, especially those made by the united efforts of the community, such as the canoe, the concept of individual ownership is unknown in many parts of Melanesia. The canoe, for instance, is regarded as the common possession of a social group, it may be a clan or a group of kinsfolk, and there is a striking absence of such disputes concerning the right of use as we might expect from the example of our own individualistic society.’

It is the custom, in some of the Melanesian islands, for a man to take off a portion of uncultivated land, to cultivate it, and then to set it apart for himself and his descendants. In the island of Mota, one of the Banks group, a man clears a piece of land and marks out an area of it for each of his children. After each of his children has received his portion the rest is left for the common use of all. Now, here also, the

curious fact is that many disputes occur over the plots assigned to the different persons, none over the land that is left for the use of all. That is to say, both man and bird get along together as long as they are together. They begin to quarrel as soon as they separate one from another. Bring them together again, let them look one another in the face, and they will live peaceably with one another.

There is that in it. And there is more than that.

Sir Oliver LODGE will be remembered, not for his scientific attainments and not for his spiritualistic adventures, but for the saying which he uttered some years ago, that the modern man is not worrying about his sins. The saying has had a mixed reception. Some have flatly contradicted it. Some have reluctantly admitted the truth of it, adding that it is all the worse for the modern man. But the saying will live. And it will live because, with all its exaggeration, it is substantially true. The modern man is *not* worrying about his sins.

Why is he not worrying? He has not considered why. He has other things to think about. But if he did consider he might say that there are two ways of it. There is the Greek way which takes life as it comes, and there is the Hebrew way which takes life as God gives it. The easier way is the Greek way. The Greek does not worry about his sins.

It is the Hebrew that worries. And if a man is to worry about his sins he must read the Bible. The modern man does not read the Bible. A Departmental Committee was appointed some time ago by the President of the Board of Education to inquire into the position of English in the education of England. The Report has been issued. It contains a section on the reading of the Bible. After referring to the Bible as the grandest thing in English literature, and for five

centuries or more the most influential, it says: 'At the present time the Bible is probably less widely read and less directly influential in our life and literature than it has been at any time since the Reformation.'

If that is true it is easy to understand why the modern man is not worrying about his sins. In order that he may begin again to worry about his sins he must begin again to read the Bible.

But why should he worry about his sins? Because he is a sinner. That is the most certain as it is the most serious fact about him. To cease worrying about his sins is not to cease sinning, as Sir Oliver LODGE seemed to signify. The modern man is a sinner, and one day he will find it out, and find that it is the most serious fact about him. It is not a matter of goodness or of badness. It is a matter of manhood. The best man we know is a sinner. It is quite time in this land of ours that we had rejected the Greek view of life, thrust upon us first by Matthew Arnold and encouraged by Sir Oliver LODGE. It is time that we had returned to the Hebrew view.

The Rev. Reginald Stewart Moxon, B.D., Headmaster of Lincoln School, encourages us to return. He has written a book on *The Doctrine of Sin* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), a great book, a searching, truthful, courageous book. In that book he shows that not since the Reformation only, but throughout the whole history of Christianity, right down to our own day, men have worried about their sins. In the fact of their sins they have seen the most serious fact of their lives. And he shows the reason. It is that men have read the Bible. In reading the Bible they have discovered the other great fact of their lives—a God with whom they have to do. That discovery it is that has made the discovery of their sins so certain. That discovery has made it so distressful.

Mr. Moxon, like the Committee of the President

of the Board of Education, would have modern men return to the reading of the Bible. And he would have them begin reading it at the beginning. That may seem, in the present 'state of our knowledge, an unwise thing to do. Mr. MOXON believes that we have passed the dangerous places. He believes that we have settled two things, and settled them once for all. The first is, that the early narratives of Genesis are not mere history and were never meant to be. The second is, that we are not under the necessity of accepting St. Paul's conclusions from them.

We are not bound, he says, and we no longer feel bound, to take the narratives of the Creation and the Fall as historically true of any particular person or persons. They are true; they are true historically. But it is universal, not particular history. It is truth that is true of the human race, not of one man and woman's experience only. 'The narrative,' he says, 'in the second and third chapters of Genesis, as might be expected from the age in which it was composed, is not unlike the legendary history of early Greece and Rome, and may be regarded as originally a naïve folk-tale relating the circumstances in which the Golden Age came to an end and the misfortunes brought upon the first men by their presumption, and which was afterwards employed by the compiler of Genesis as the vehicle of instruction as to the nature of sin. Indeed, the substance of these chapters, as distinct from the allegorical and poetical form in which they are clothed, must be considered as representing objective fact, and it is broadly true as an account of human origins. Here we see the naked savage, lisping for his first words new names of beast and bird, innocent in sheer ignorance of evil, becoming dimly conscious of disobedience, of guilt and of shame, twining leaves to cover his nakedness or sewing together the skins of beasts, desperately fighting for existence against thorns and briars, bearing children who murder one another in senseless jealousy. This record seems to be very little removed from the evolutionary view, which says that man has

fought his way up from the very dust of chaos, moving steadily onwards in spite of many setbacks and coming at last to a conception of morality and of God.'

We are not bound to take these narratives as bare historic fact. And we are not bound to draw from them the conclusions which St. Paul drew. For 'it is impossible,' says Mr. Moxon, 'to extract from these chapters anything like the theological inferences of a Fall and of Original Sin. They are entirely devoid of any theological or metaphysical theories of a weakness of will or bias towards evil inherited by the descendants of our first parents. The theological doctrine of the Fall occurs neither in Genesis nor in the rest of the Old Testament; the sole Scriptural authority for it is to be found in the writings of S. Paul. Now, it is no longer possible to feel certain that all the ideas of S. Paul are necessarily identical with those of the Founder of Christianity; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe that he retained much of his antecedent thought when he passed from Moses to Christ, and that Christians are not of necessity bound to accept, as inherently Christian, much that S. Paul taught, not as a Christian but as a learned Jew. Even an Apostle could not change his past. His theology is of Christ, but his anthropology is Jewish. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, contains not the slightest allusion to an alleged Fall, nor to a hereditary bias towards evil, but this idea was familiar to the Rabbinical teachers of the first century A.D.'

'It is therefore probable that the conception of the Fall and Original Sin as it appears in Rom. v. 12-14 forms no part of the original Gospel, but represents ideas imported by S. Paul into Christianity from the Rabbinical Judaism in which he had been brought up. If, therefore, we wish, according to the modern catch-phrase, to get "back to Christ," we must go behind S. Paul and sweep away the doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin as mere speculations which we are at liberty

to consider for ourselves without being committed to regard them from the standpoint of one whose views were moulded by Jewish antecedents, except in so far as he had consciously remodelled them to fit his new faith.'

Well, it may be so, and it may not. That,

after all, is a matter of interpretation. This is the essential thing, and this Mr. MOXON emphasizes as strongly as man can do, that we have all sinned and come short, and that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. The Bible from the beginning tells us that. And in telling us that the Bible from the beginning is true.

Is the Statement of the One Faith in the Form of a Creed necessary or desirable in the Re-united Church?

BY THE REVEREND F. BERTRAM CLOGG, M.A., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN RICHMOND COLLEGE, SURREY.

It has been my privilege to be present at several gatherings of clergy and ministers in the last few years, and I confess that the divergence of the views expressed would sometimes have made me despair had there not always been felt a spirit of fellowship which was more real than the things which divided us. It is said that there is a point high up in the air where sounds that are discordant below lose their discord and blend in harmony, and we believe that there is one Spirit, who is leading us all upwards along different paths, and that if we are faithful to His guidance we shall find those paths presently converge.

There's a legion that never was listed,
That carries no banner nor crest,
But split in a thousand detachments
Is breaking the road for the rest.

It is something at any rate if any of us can play some little part in 'breaking the road for the rest.' Since this paper is only the prelude to a conference, it is prepared rather with a view to 'breaking the road.' Such conclusions as are reached are tentative, for it is recognized that the conception of the re-united Church is such that, I venture to suggest, none of us can grasp its full significance, or lightly say what is necessary or desirable in regard to it.

To begin with, it is almost impossible to separate this question from others. For it is only after we have settled what degree of unity of faith is necessary in the re-united Church that we can say whether it is necessary or desirable that that one Faith should be formulated in a creed. Further, our estimate of its necessity or desirability depends

largely upon the form of the creed. If, for the sake of argument, the Athanasian creed or some such symbol were suggested, which is, of course, most unlikely, many of us feel to have no creed would be far preferable. And again much depends upon the way in which the creed would be used, whether it is necessary or desirable. If, therefore, this paper touches upon these other questions incidentally, I trust it may not be thought unduly straying from the question which occupies our immediate attention.

Can there be a Church without any formal expression of its Faith in a creed? The existence of some of the so-called Free Churches answers that question in the affirmative. The Church, *e.g.*, which I represent here has no creed in the same sense as the Anglican Church has the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. John Wesley established a society within the Church of England which later became a separate society. There were two conditions of membership—that a man desire to be saved from his sins, and to flee from the wrath to come. It was not till about thirty years ago that the name Society was changed to Church. Need I say the change of name did not constitute the society a Church? It is the fellowship of men and women with one another in Christ which makes a Church, and not a name. Still in a small number of our Churches there is used the Anglican liturgy, for the morning, including, of course, the Apostles' or Nicene creed, but in no case is that confession required for membership. Neither are the ministers of the Church required to confess adherence

to any formal creed. They assent to the doctrines of the Church as found in certain of Wesley's sermons and notes on the N.T., and each year in Synod each minister is required to affirm afresh that he believes and preaches those doctrines. It is understood that these sermons constitute a general expression of Evangelical Christianity, and that loyalty is expected rather to the essential truth than to this eighteenth-century expression of it. But though no creed is actually formulated, the standards have never been felt to be so vague but that they have been used from time to time, much in the same way as most creeds have been used, as a test of orthodoxy. However, the principle that 'the living Church is the interpreter of its own standards' has generally prevented much mischief being done thereby.

There is no intention here to suggest such a system for the re-united Church, far from it. It is merely an illustration to show that a formal creed is not a necessity to a Church. *Ubi Christus, not a creed, Ibi Ecclesia.*

If a creed is not of the *esse* of the Church, is it of the *bene esse*?

If there were no standard for Faith, what then? A Church without a recognized order would quickly be full of confusion: without some standard of Faith it would be easy for men who were themselves deluded to delude others: without that to which appeal might be made there would be endless strife: and the re-united Church would be presently split into more fragments than it is now: the seamless garment would be rent anew. That does not imply any distrust of the guidance of the Spirit of God. I should be the last to deny that the Spirit moves outside all organizations and systems, but I should be the first to admit that His influence is most often felt among those whose own spiritual life is definitely linked with that of all the Christian generations. We cannot make channels for the Spirit as we make channels for the watercourses, as George Eliot puts it, and say flow here but flow not there, but we all know that the Spirit does flow along the well-recognized channels. It is necessary to the well-being of the Church that there should be some authoritative deposit, which links the Faith of the present to the Faith once delivered to the saints. The roots of Christianity are in history, not in the air.

But if that be granted, such a standard is not a creed as ordinarily understood. Is it necessary

that the Faith should be expressed in a creed? It may well be doubted if the unity of the Church could be duly appreciated by most people without some definite statement of the truths which are held in common. And if the Spirit seeks some visible body, *i.e.* the Church, in which to find expression, that same Spirit of Truth and Life may seek some outward form in words, though it must not be forgotten that

Words, like nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within.

The Christian Faith, it has been well said, contains two elements: (1) an intellectual assent to certain facts and their meaning; (2) a moral and spiritual affirmation.

The first is the response of the reason to certain propositions, and it is generally understood that this is that for which a creed stands. Consider this side for a moment. Unless the new creed of the re-united Church were so short that it would be robbed of much of its value, it would become quickly out of date. At any rate no form of words which clearly expresses the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation which follows. And by the fact that a new creed was drawn up—I assume a new creed would be a practical necessity, because the several Churches which would form the re-united Church would not unite on the basis of any one of the historic creeds, which are not even acceptable to many members of the Churches which now use them—by the very fact that a new creed was put out, by that fact it is tacitly assumed that no creed can be final. Is it desirable to be continually revising the creed?

Further, a creed conceived as a statement of doctrine, to which intellectual assent is required and nothing more, will almost inevitably exclude from the fellowship of the visible Church some honest seekers after truth, whose loyalty to Christ is unquestioned, but who conscientiously refuse to bind themselves by dogmatic statements which, later, may not seem to them to represent the truth. It is certainly not desirable to exclude these, even if the advantages of having a creed are so great as to make it necessary.

But the intellectual assent to certain propositions is only one element in the Faith, the other is the moral and spiritual affirmation, the response of the will, of the whole personality to a principle of

life. This, it is sometimes claimed, is indefinable, therefore it cannot be expressed in a creed. Is that the whole truth? Westcott claims that the form of the early creeds, *πιστεύομεν εἰς*, means not merely, 'I give my assent to a truth,' but, 'I trust in a person'; not, 'something is true,' but, 'some one is the stay of my life.' It is the expression of personal trust, not merely of intellectual conviction. If Westcott is right, then the creeds have all been sadly misunderstood, and half the bitter prejudice against them is due to misunderstanding. If something of the height and depth of the Christian Faith could find expression in words, we should hear less of 'shaken creeds.' The Faith of many a man was shipwrecked by the tragedy of the war, because that Faith was only expressed for him in forms which were outworn. What help was it during those dark days to recall his belief in Him 'Who was of one substance with the Father,' and so on? His confession of Faith should be that to which the Christian should naturally turn when the rains descend and the floods come. But in days of confusion men turned not to the Nicene creed, but more often to the Fourth Gospel, because it was alive with religious Faith. There will be no real use in a new creed unless it is born, not out of bitter controversy, like so many others, but out of great Faith, and expressed, not in the too often arid forms of the theological schools, but in the language of the heart, which is understood in all generations.

The common ground among Christians of all communions is that they love the same things, rather than that they think the same. To-day the emphasis is being more and more laid on religion as an experience not a formula, a life not a system. It may be doubted whether Paul and James, Origen and Francis of Assisi, Ignatius Loyola, Luther, Wesley, Newman, Kingsley, and General Booth would all have subscribed the same creed: they were much nearer each other in experience than in intellectual beliefs. They were one in the reality of their experience of communion with God in Christ. The simple and ignorant man who, once a slave of vice, has known his personality freed, cleansed, and re-created through Christ, is much nearer to the author of the Fourth Gospel in his spiritual experience than in adherence to the Logos doctrine. If in the re-united Church this experiential side of the one Faith can be emphasized: if 'I trust in' be substituted for, or

added to, 'I believe in,' then a creed is most desirable. For here surely is where we are all one—Greek, Roman, Anglican, Free Church, Society of Friends. That which makes the Holy Communion Service precious to us all is our experience of the presence of Christ, our sense of communion with God: we all have our different theories about it: they divide us; but our experience already unites us. Therefore, if any form of words can be found in which this common experience is implicit—obviously it can never be made adequately explicit—it will make more vivid to us our sense of fellowship with the noblest souls who have ever lived or are now living on this earth. A creed understood in that sense would be a symbol of unity, not an acid test to keep people away. Inevitably a creed will exclude; but if it symbolizes a way of life, and is not merely a statement of truth, which must become outgrown because of the development of human knowledge, those who will be kept out are those who are not willing to do the will of God in order to know of its truth, not those whose minds are but poorly furnished with theological knowledge, nor those who, to use a recent phrase of Canon Lyttelton's, refuse to attempt 'to define and cabin the infinite love of God.'

The historic creeds grew by a process of definition of errors. The creed of the re-united Church must be the spontaneous expression of those great truths by which men live, not the attenuated result of years of controversy acclaimed as a triumph of ecclesiastical strategy. Men are generally more right in what they affirm than in what they deny. A statement of religious rather than theological convictions is certainly desirable, and, I should say, necessary to the well-being of the Church. 'We ought to know and to affirm the unity which binds us together.' Of course there are varieties of experience, but they are on another plane from the diversity of outlook which comes from widely differing schools of thought. We have long been singing the same hymns together and praying the same prayers, and it is not without significance that 'the most sacred form of words and the most typical of Christianity is a prayer—the Lord's Prayer.' Therein is an expression of the personal trust which is of the essence of religion, and no man can recite those familiar words without being reminded of the practical issue of that trust: 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done.'

May I, in conclusion, attempt to sum up some of the points touched in what has gone before:

1. Is a creed necessary to the *esse* of the Church?

2. Is it necessary to the *bene esse*? Or is it only desirable to have some standard vaguely defined and not formulated in a creed?

3. Is it necessary or desirable for the sake of continuity with the past and to preserve continuity in the future? Are there not some communions which would be afraid of the licence of an unformulated Faith, and, for their sakes, would not a creed be a practical necessity? It would have to be a new creed, for there are many Christian people who respect the Nicene creed as of great historical interest, but who would not be willing to bind themselves by what they regard as its outworn metaphysics. They want a creed which the cultivated man can accept with head erect and

without any equivocation in his heart, as Dr. Sanday once put it. It would have to be a new creed, and the very idea of a new creed supposes no finality in any creed.

4. Since the real continuity is that of a spirit of life, not of a system of doctrine, is it not desirable that a statement of the religious convictions which we all hold in common should be expressed in words? The difference between this and the more usual forms of creed would be, among other things, that this would perhaps more naturally take the form of a hymn or a prayer. Edwin Hatch seems to have been feeling after some such form when, in the pulpit of Westminster Abbey nearly forty years ago, he declared his creed to be the acceptance of the Apostolic Benediction: 'The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all.'

Literature.

HUMAN MARRIAGE.

THE first edition of *The History of Human Marriage*, by Edward Westermarck, was published in one volume. The fifth edition is in three volumes (Macmillan; 84s. net). And they are substantial volumes, having in all 1795 octavo pages. That, and the fact that five editions of such a book have been called for, is what the hesitating and the incredulous need to prove the importance of the comparative study of Religion.

This is a comparative study of Religion. There is much superstition, magic, wizardry in it; there is much social custom and convention; there is cruelty as well as kindness; there is lust as well as love: but it is all religion or on the way to it; and most of even the horrid habits which the book has to tell us of are due to a perverted or immature conception of God and the duty which God requires of man.

Some of the chapters are undoubtedly difficult reading. Professor Westermarck has no sentimental respect for our sensibilities. His work is scientific, and science has to do with facts not feelings. But even at the blackest we can see that God has nowhere left Himself without

witness. Some ray of consideration strikes in to dispel a little of the dark. Some kindly custom relieves the victim of the extremity of cruel usage. Some way of escape is winked at that the degradation may not be altogether inhuman. And Dr. Westermarck's investigations, so rigidly scientific as they are, have had the effect of at least making improbable some of the ugliest of the customs, such as that which is called the *jus primæ noctis*. He seems almost reluctant to let it go, but the evidence for its existence is worthless.

One thing is puzzling. Where did Professor Westermarck obtain his knowledge of the English language? He was and is Professor of Philosophy at the Academy of Abo in Finland. We know that he has spent time in London. We know that he is or was Martin White Professor of Sociology in the University there. But that does not explain it. For his knowledge of the English tongue far surpasses that of the home-born Englishman, even when the Englishman has been well educated, even when he has been specially trained to write well. In his command of our language he recalls Max Müller. We do not at the moment think of any one else who can be named in comparison. The only difference between Max Müller

and him is that the former was often rhetorical and unreliable, the latter is always simple, straightforward, and scientific. Let one short paragraph illustrate.

'Among the Greeks and Romans in early days, as among the Hindus, marriage evidently was a union of great stability, although in later times, contrary to what was the case among the Aryans of India, it became extremely easy and frequent. Among the Greeks of the Homeric age divorce seems to have been almost unknown; but afterwards it became an everyday event in Greece. According to Attic law the husband could repudiate his wife whenever he liked and without stating any motives. It is possible that the repudiation generally took place before witnesses, but this does not seem to have been a legal necessity. The husband, however, was compelled to send his divorced wife back to her father's house with her dowry, and there is no evidence that he could claim the dowry even though the woman had been guilty of adultery or was repudiated for some other fault on her part. If the wife had been convicted of adultery it was necessary for the husband to divorce her, condonation of the offence being visited by *atimia*, or infamy. To repudiate a barren wife was also a sort of duty, both on religious and patriotic grounds, since one of the principal reasons for marriage was to assure the continuation of the family and the perpetuation of the State. The dissolution of marriage could, further, take place by mutual consent, probably without any formalities, except perhaps that, according to usage, the parties made a declaration to the Archon about their divorce. The wife could demand a divorce by appealing to the Archon and stating the motives for her demand. When a marriage was dissolved, the children remained with the father, even though the divorce had been effected by the wife on account of the misconduct of her husband.'

SCHWEITZER.

Albert Schweitzer is a remarkable man. He made a sensation by his book *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*—in this country almost a revolution when it was translated under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Since then he has written an equally radical volume on St. Paul, and a searching study of the Messianic Idea in the

Gospels. He deserves the title of Doctor of Divinity.

But he is also a Doctor of Music. His organ concerts in Paris and elsewhere were events in the musical world. He is recognized as the best interpreter of Bach, of whom he wrote the authoritative estimate in two great volumes.

Finally, he is a doctor of medicine. Becoming deeply impressed with the sufferings of the African natives and their need of doctors, he studied medicine and took his degree. In 1913 he sailed for Equatorial Africa, along with his wife, who had qualified as a nurse. He tells the story of his experiences and discoveries in a book which is called *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest* (A. & C. Black; 6s. net).

He is a remarkable man, and this is a remarkable book. The translation, made by Ch. Th. Campion, is so excellent that not for a moment are you conscious of reading a translation. Every sentence tells. It is manifest that this many-gifted man has the gift of vision, outward and inward. He did not go to the Congo as a missionary of the gospel. Only once do we read that he preached, and then it was an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. He is a doctor. And as a doctor he gave himself wholly and wholeheartedly to the cure of those diseases which African flesh seems so disastrously heir to. He is both physician and surgeon.

Take him as a physician. One of the commonest diseases is strangulated hernia. He says: 'How can I describe my feelings when a poor fellow is brought me in this condition? I am the only person within hundreds of miles who can help him. Because I am here and am supplied by my friends with the necessary means, he can be saved, like those who came before him in the same condition and those who will come after him, while otherwise he would have fallen a victim to the torture. This does not mean merely that I can save his life. We must all die. But that I can save him from days of torture, that is what I feel as my great and ever new privilege. Pain is a more terrible lord of mankind than even death himself.'

As a surgeon: 'Hitherto all my operations have been successful, and that raises the confidence of the natives to a pitch that almost terrifies me. What impresses them most of all is the anæsthetics, and they talk a great deal about them. The girls

in our school exchange letters with those in a Sunday school at home, and in one of them there was the following piece of news: "Since the Doctor came here we have seen the most wonderful things happen. First of all he kills the sick people; then he cures them, and after that he wakes them up again." For anæsthesia seems to the native the same thing as being dead, and similarly if one of them wants to make me understand that he has had an apoplectic fit, he says: "I was dead."

He has considered most of the problems which face the missionary and the trader—forced labour, polygamy, and what not. But the problem of problems is alcohol. Again and again he returns to it. There are more references to it in the Index than to any other subject. And it is all the doing of the white man. Alcohol and the slave trade have been the cause of incredible cruelty and have depopulated vast areas of the country. In the Ogowé lowlands 'we have at present merely the remains of eight once powerful tribes, so terribly has the population been thinned by three hundred years of alcohol and the slave trade.'

THE BANTU.

Mr. Dugald Campbell has lived for nine-and-twenty years among the far-travelled tribes called Bantu, and the time has come for him to write down what he has learned about them. He calls his book *In the Heart of Bantuland* (Seeley; 21s. net). He has learned much, some of it new and surprising. His book is a contribution to the science of Anthropology, which every student of that science will have to take knowledge of.

His very first sentence is a surprise. The phrase 'going West' he tells us is African. It is said of the Bantu negro when he dies that he has gone West. For 'the West has always been associated among the Bantu tribes with darkness and death, misery and misfortune. The West was the home of the slavers whose coming with firearms and rum brought devastation and sorrow to countless peoples, and "to go West" to tens of thousands of Africans meant literally to go to sure and certain death; the red road from the interior to the West Coast it was, alas! only too truly. In these parts of Africa where I have lived for the past twenty-nine years of my life, the West Coast is known as *Mbonshi* or "dead man's land." The root word signifies "Hell," and is so translated in many

missionary publications.' But our men did not mean all that by the phrase. We thank God that they did not.

Mr. Campbell recalls the days of slavery with their horrors. There are cruel customs among the Bantu still, but none so cruel as those. He has a short chapter on their Religion. Bantu religion is not so degrading as that of some African tribes. There is a sense of justice even in God's ways with men. 'They have a little song they sing about God, the lizard, and the frog. The lizard plays on the dulcimer and sings:

"I shall sing a song of praise to God.

Strike the chords of the piano.

God who gives us all good things.

Strike the chords of the piano.

Wives, and wealth, and wisdom.

Strike the chords of the piano."

'The frog speaks. "Quiet," says the frog. "God doesn't hear the singing of an animal with a tail like you. Go and dock your tail." God thereupon descends with a rush on the wings of the wind and enquires: "Who was that I heard singing that pretty song?" "Croak! Croak! Croak! It was I," says the frog. "No," says God, "that was not the voice I heard singing." Then the lizard replies: "It was I." "Play and sing the words over again," says God. The lizard plays and sings as before:

"I shall sing a song of praise to God.

Strike the chords of the piano," etc.

"Ah, yes," said God, "that was the music and the song I heard," and God gave the lizard all the beautiful colours of life, and left the frog with nothing but his ugly bloated face and his hoarse, rasping, croaky voice.'

The Bantu have even an idea of evolution. But it is an inverted idea. 'Monkeys,' they say, 'were once human beings like us, but to escape work they fled into the forest and grew tails.'

UNITY.

One of the questions of keenest discussion is the question of Progress. We owe that to the infallible instinct of the Dean of St. Paul's. Dr. Inge may speak rightly or wrongly, acceptably or intolerably; he always speaks to make men listen.

Now, whatever Dr. Inge may say, there is one

respect in which we have made progress and are making it. We are moving in the direction of Unity. We are moving in the direction of Unity in all things. The sciences are beginning to recognize an element and an interest common to all of them. Philosophy and science are finding themselves travelling the same road to the same end, though they have come into it from different side-paths—in which some philosophies and some sciences are walking still. Science and philosophy have truly and openly discovered that their end is the end aimed at by religion and theology, and they are finding gaps in the wall which hitherto has separated their parallel ways. Science, Philosophy, Religion—all are discovering God, one God, and in that discovery a Universe that is a Unity in Him.

That (in however crude synopsis) is the meaning of the able and enterprising volume which has been published under the title of *The Unity of the Spirit* (Christophers). The author is G. F. Barbour, D.Phil.

The book is itself an evidence of the progress we are making towards unity. For it is a philosopher's book, and yet it is a book of most valuable instruction in theology. Take the discussion of vicarious suffering, and these two invaluable paragraphs on it:

'When such a fundamental division breaks the peace of a home, by estranging husband from wife or parent from child, we know that it can only be overcome by the power of a love which is willing to face suffering and assume penalties which in strict justice would fall on other shoulders. But such vicarious suffering comes to be more than mere suffering: it becomes the sacrifice that reconciles and redeems. It was from the midst of one of the most poignant personal tragedies recorded in ancient literature—the tragedy of a home desecrated and betrayed, but finally renewed by a patient forgiveness which refused to despair—that the prophet Hosea rose to the great intuition that at the very heart of things there was a love more patient, a hope more unconquerable, a forgiveness more unwearied than any that the human spirit could exert; and so he was enabled to sing the very lyric of reunion, based on his own experience in his own home, but infinitely heightened, and with a far wider span and range: "I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment,

and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt know the Lord."

'What is true of the broken sanctity of a personal bond such as marriage holds no less of all the deepest divisions that come between men in other spheres. It is false to say that the crooked cannot be made straight; but, as a limb once broken and wrongly set may need to be broken again before a cure is possible, so the distortions of the spiritual life can only be straightened at the cost of fresh pain; and this must often be the pain of another. The broken unity in the natural order cannot be made good save by the sacrificial breaking, in the spiritual order, of some other body or spirit. But this is above all the discovery and the message of Christianity.'

LITURGICAL PRAYER.

An Introduction to the Roman Breviary, written by the Right Rev. Fernand Cabrol, O.S.B., Abbot of Farnborough, was published in 1900 and is in its fifteenth thousand in French. It has been translated into Spanish and German, and now by a Benedictine of Stanbrook into English. The title is *Liturgical Prayer: Its History and Spirit* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 12s. 6d. net).

Dom Cabrol believes in the Roman Liturgy, its excellence and its precedence. 'We confess,' he says, 'to having been painfully surprised at finding in *Notes sur l'Angleterre*, by Taine, a eulogy of the *Book of Common Prayer* which leads one to suspect that the writer in question, exceptionally broad-minded as he is and usually so well-informed, did not know that its prayers are taken from the Catholic Liturgy, nor that the book whose beauty he admired merely presents that Liturgy in an impoverished or even mutilated form; so much is admitted by certain of the Anglican clergy themselves, for many lay aside their official book and adopt the Catholic Liturgy.'

Anglicans will not be worried with such a statement. It will be good reason to them for studying this book. It is, as the author calls it, a kind of liturgical anthology, so many are the extracts from devotional and liturgical writers that are found in it. But its great purpose is to show how the Roman Breviary came into use and then was modified to meet every new need until at last it reached its stereotyped form. 'It is the law of

uninterrupted progress and transformation which the study of primitive Liturgy brings out so clearly. Such a process of evolution ought not to surprise us; we find it here as elsewhere, and it seems to be a universal law of life. The reason for each of these changes may be found in the natural development of Christian society, whose needs and aspirations are ever changing.'

The student of liturgies is not likely to neglect this book. There is much in it also that is profitable for private devotion.

TROPICAL AFRICA.

Wild Bush Tribes of Tropical Africa: 'An Account of Adventure and Travel amongst Pagan People in Tropical Africa, with a Description of their Manners of Life, Customs, Heathenish Rites and Ceremonies, Secret Societies, Sport and Warfare, collected during a Sojourn of Twelve Years.' That is the title in full of Mr. G. Cyril Claridge's book (Seeley; 21s. net). It is not too glorious a title. The book fulfils it to the letter, and adds forty-one illustrations and a map.

The style is easy and effective. The author knows what he is writing about and knows that he knows. Once or twice he is at variance with others who have lived where he has lived. Thus he says: 'The women themselves are responsible for the practice of polygamy. They are driven by fetish delusions, after childbirth, to isolate themselves from their husbands for three years, or even five, during which time neither husband nor wife can pass the gulf which a stupid habit has thrust between them. To bridge the period of separation the negro multiplies his wives.'

Dr. Albert Schweitzer also discusses polygamy. He does not blame the women and he does not condemn polygamy. This is what he says: 'Where the population lives in bamboo huts, and society is not so organised that a woman can earn her own living, there is no room for the unmarried woman, and if all women are to be married, polygamy is a necessary condition. Moreover, there are in the forest neither cows nor nanny goats, so that a mother must suckle her child for a long time if it is to be reared. Polygamy safeguards the claims of the child, for after its birth the woman has the right, and the duty, of living only for her child; she is now no longer a wife, but only a mother, and she often spends the

greater part of this time with her parents. At the end of three years comes the weaning, which is marked by a festival, and then she returns to her husband's hut to be a wife once more. But this living for her child is not to be thought of unless the man has another wife, or other wives, to make a home for him and look after his banana plots.'

Mr. Claridge has intense pity for the Congo woman. 'The life of the average Congo woman vacillates, pendulum-like, between farms and babies, which form the two principal interests of her existence. From sunrise to sunset she plants, hoes, waters, and harvests, often weighted with a baby on her back, and brass rings on her legs. As she comes from the valley she saves time by cracking the pumpkin seeds between her teeth for the evening repast, putting the kernels into a basket poised on her head as she goes along. On her back may be a child feeding from a breast either passed under the armpit or over the shoulder. At night she pounds the meal and cooks it. Her nights are but the prelude to a dawn of the same routine. She finds the food to feed the family and the money to pay the tax. The clink of her anklets is the ring of a servitude worse than slavery. She is often a withered, shrivelled, bent old hag before she has passed the prime of life. She is frequently seen carrying a load which some of us would shrink from putting across the back of a donkey. Though a whole batch of men, including her husband, may pass her on the way to the same town, with nothing heavier than a walking-stick, not one of them will deign to give her a helping hand. The wheel of destiny grinds her from puberty to burial. Then her daughters repeat the tragedy.'

In America religious education is a business proposition. It has to be organized as a great commercial combine is organized. The whole theory and much of the practice is to be learned from *Organization and Administration of Religious Education* (Abingdon Press; \$1.50 net). The author is John Elbert Stout, Professor of Administration in Religious Education, Northwestern University.

Can religion be taught by acting? That is the question that is answered in *Pageantry and Dramatics in Religious Education* by William V.

Meredith (Abingdon Press; \$1.25 net). It is answered in the affirmative, and that emphatically, and not emphatically only but demonstrably. For there are pictures of how it is done as well as instructions in how to do it.

Another book, issued by the same Press, recommends the acting of plays specially prepared for the purpose, and presents us with the plays. The title is *Shorter Bible Plays*, the author Rita Benton (\$1.25 net). The illustrations are expressive.

The first number is issued of an *Anglo-Jewish Annual* (Alliance Publishing Company; 1s. net). The editor is Mr. Barnett Friedberg, and to him is due the whole idea and the working out of it. The chief Rabbi sends his best wishes. The greater portion of the space is occupied with a diary interleaved with blotting-paper—serviceable and sensible and worth the cost of the Annual in these days. But there is much useful knowledge crammed into the rest of the pages, in very small but quite clear type. And there are many portraits of contemporary British Jews, Sir Herbert Samuel prominent on the cover. The most useful feature is a 'Who's Who in Jewry.'

When the Rev. Robert Stevenson, D.D., Minister of Gargunnoch, was appointed Baird Lecturer for 1920 he at once decided to lecture on Patriotism. He was waiting for his opportunity. The subject was a great, even a glorious, one in his eyes; most pertinent to the times also; and he had studied it long and carefully. The lecture is now published under the title of *The Christian Vindication of Patriotism* (Blackwood; 6s. net).

The book is a surprise of interest. The need of a thorough and unbiased study of Patriotism is urgent, but so much has been said about it in our time, and so much of that foolishly, that the promise of novelty was poor, even the hope of ordinary interest feeble. Dr. Stevenson has proved it to be not only a living subject, but also a subject that can never die. Pass to the very widest sympathy of which man is capable, pass to his highest aspiration, he is still a patriot, and patriotism is still a force to be reckoned with.

Look into the book. Look into it at the place where the Old Testament patriot is discovered. 'Instead of reviewing incidents familiar to every Bible reader, we shall single out one particular

form of patriotic heroism, less striking to the eye but not less important, wherein the goodly fellowship of the Hebrew Prophets blazed out a new path for the human race. We mean, the path wherein a patriot encounters the hardest of all tasks in patriotic sacrifice—the censuring and withstanding his country, where he thinks his country wrong. Certain patriots have had to play the part of those

"Who, loving as none other
The land that is their mother,
Unflinching renounced her
Because they loved her so."

This is by far the most crushing burden a patriot can be called to carry. Other forms of patriotism are elementary compared with this. To love one's country when it is worthy of love, and then, as moved by that impulse, to seek to serve it bravely, is no doubt a high task, and one covetous of the best that human nature can supply. But it is a task containing its own reward. The impulse to fulfil it rouses all the dormant faculties to healthful activity; the undertaking of it pleurably stirs the blood; and the even partial achievement of it brings deep heart-content. But to love one's country in the very hour when bitter shame must accompany the love; to care for it in its moral ugliness as Beauty cared for the Beast, hoping against hope for transformation, but conscious (unlike Beauty) that no caress will work the miracle—such a task touches the essential nerve of devout patriotism as nothing else can do. It means that the patriot must stand alone, amidst a crowd of fellow-countrymen who impugn the very love which consumes him. The most he loves, the less he will seem to love. He must choose between two loyalties, in the consciousness that the higher of the two makes no appeal to those whose support he would most value. Misunderstanding must infect and poison the air he breathes. Robert Browning, in his poem entitled "The Patriot," has described the man who, one short year before, had beheld the housetops crowded with cheering hero-worshippers, saying in disillusionment:

"There's nobody on the housetops now—
Just a palsied few at the windows set;
For the best of the sight is, all allow,
At the Shambles' Gate—or, better yet,
By the very scaffold's foot, I trow."

"There is something in the mere utterance of truth," George Adam Smith has said, "which rouses the very devil in the hearts of many men."

Editor and Publishers are together to be congratulated on the issue of the hundredth volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net). Fifty years is a long run. And it is the very same paper—take it weekly, monthly, or yearly—as it was at the beginning. The sermons are not the same, they are very different. But the paper is the same, a fair representation of the best preaching of all churches and schools of the day. One sign of progress in this very volume is the inclusion of a sermon by Miss A. Maude Royden. A fine sermon it is, clear in thought, true in theology, in touch with modern life. We take the liberty of condensing that sermon and quoting it on another page.

Messrs. Constable have done well to publish in one handy volume, *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri*, translated by Charles Eliot Norton. The literal prose translation serves two purposes. In the first place it is the book for the beginner in the study of Dante's Italian. And in the second place it gives us Dante and not the translator. Pope's Homer was Pope; Norton's Dante is Dante. The beginner will be glad of the Notes. They are not many and they are not long; yet they leave no word unexplained and the explanation is sufficient. The Dante scholar will rejoice in the version of a scholar with fine literary feeling and will compare his own translation with it.

Under the title of *The Mantle of Elijah* (Doran; \$1.50 net), Damon Dalrymple has written a book for preachers. It is given in the form of a farewell address of Elijah to Elisha. The address occupies the volume. It repeats Elisha's name in every paragraph: 'Life is a great glad game, Elisha, to those who play it gladly.' And it is independent of chronology. Elisha is reminded of what Jesus did and Paul said. His attention is directed to the straits of modern science: 'Modern science is at its wits' end, Elisha. All roads have led it to Rome, but none of its keys will unlock the gates of the Eternal City.' The last chapter is a succession of terrifying 'don'ts.' 'Don't thresh out the truth before your people, Elisha.' 'Don't disturb the faith of old folks, Elisha, whether dead

or alive.' 'Don't preach either lower or higher criticism, Elisha. For God's sake, and your own soul's sake, don't.'

It is not surprising that in these days of overwhelming psychology we should have *The Gift of Tongues* explained as neither more nor less than 'nerves.' The surprise is that the explanation comes from a parson. Under that title the Rev. Alexander Mackie, Minister of the Tully Memorial Presbyterian Church, of Sharon Hill, Pennsylvania, has published a book (Doran; \$2 net) in which he gives us details of the ways of the Ursuline Nuns and the Devils of Loudun, the Camisards or French Prophets, the Shakers and the Millennial Church, the Irvingites or Catholic Apostolic Church and the Mormons, selecting the ways that were most eccentric, and then—the Gift of Tongues is another.

Well, it is not. Neither were these other affairs so free from religion and morality as Mr. Mackie would have us think; nor, when he has exhibited them all, and in all their extravagance, has he touched the central thing which made that Pentecostal day momentous.

'Dry' America: *An Object Lesson to India*, is the title of a book written by Mr. St. Nihal Singh to help in the campaign against alcohol on which India is entered (Madras: Ganesh; 4s.). The investigation into the results of prohibition in America has been thorough. The benefits are beyond expectation, even the expectation of the sanguine. They are worth consideration on our part.

The most unexpected result is the prosperity of the distillers, brewers, and saloon keepers. Take Washington. 'There were three breweries in that city. One was turned into a "soft" drink factory. Another—the National Capitol Brewery, which employed about 50 men and used raw materials to the value of \$130,000 annually—was transformed into an ice-cream factory employing 150 workers and using raw materials to the value of \$400,000 annually. Instead of turning out 65,000 barrels of beer it is making 800,000 gallons of ice-cream each year—more than one-fourth of the ice-cream used by Washington. It may be noted in passing that the consumption of ice-cream has doubled since prohibition went into effect. In only one instance did a Washington brewery go

entirely out of business and that was because the family who owned it had made so much money it decided to retire.' There is the answer to the 'pity the poor brewer' cry.

But this is still better. 'Next to eatables, the most notable increase in trade has been in the sale of shoes. The very first Saturday after the "dry" law went into effect in Omaha, Nebraska, there was an increased demand for shoes—chiefly children's—a demand which was very much larger the second Saturday. Within ten months after the triumph of prohibition in Seattle, Washington, a shoe company opened three new shops in buildings formerly occupied by five liquor shops. The president of that company stated that fifty per cent. more children's shoes and, as a rule, a better quality of shoes, are being bought now than when the wealth of the nation was being poured into the saloon-keeper's till.'

The Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th., has added one more book to the long list already written by him and published in this country. The title is *Glories of the Love of Jesus* (Longmans; 5s. net), and the manner is as before, close affectionate devotion to the Person of our Redeemer.

Into the Prayer Book of 1662 a Prayer was inserted for the High Court of Parliament. In that Prayer occur the words 'that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations.' These words have been taken by the Right Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D., Bishop of Chester, as the subject of a book for Lent. He calls it *Peace and Happiness* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net).

It is another plea for reconstruction. But the Bishop of Chester goes the right way about it. He would have reconstruction of the person first. Is the man right with God, in the inmost soul of him? Then he will be right with his fellow-men and will do his bit in setting the world on its legs again. The style is colloquial. Bishop Paget deliberately discards theological and antiquarian language. He even condescends to 'terribly' and 'awfully.' 'We have fallen into horribly exaggerated ways of speech. We are dreadfully emphatic.' So there is no escape. This is direct address to the conscience in the most modern form of speech.

Mr. John Maynard Keynes, C.B., made a great

hit by his book on the Economic Consequences of the Peace. The Government felt the necessity of giving attention to it, and it was translated into nearly every European language. He has now written another book, a sequel to the first, and called it *A Revision of the Treaty* (Macmillan).

There are two parts. The first part goes back into the past; the second looks forward into the future. The first part is history; the second prophecy. In the first part he says triumphantly, 'I told you so'; in the second part he says magisterially, 'and now I tell you again.'

And yet, what would he have had our rulers do? Did they have no inkling, none of them, that the terms of the Treaty were in some respects impracticable? And if they had, was the only way to propose and carry other terms? If Mr. Keynes had been one of the 'Big Four,' would he have proposed and carried other terms—proposed and carried? But it is not worth discussing. Here is the story of all the Conferences and all the changes made by them on the Treaty, and here is the way that all Conferences and changes must go in the future.

Mr. Humphrey Milford has issued a new edition of that indispensable among the indispensables—F. Howard Collins' *Authors' and Printers' Dictionary*, and he has issued it cheap (3s. 6d. net). Printers should insist upon every person who writes for the press having it at their hand. Its chief value is in enabling us all to spell our words in the same way. But it adds to one's accomplishments in many ways, or hides one's lack of them.

One of the cheapest and best books published this season has the short title *No Licence* (National Citizens' Council, 15 Gordon Street, Glasgow; 2s., post free 2s. 4d.). It is the Handbook of the National Citizens' Council Temperance (Scotland) Act. The editor is Mr Tom Honeyman. Everything is in it that one ought to know, and every one ought to know everything that is in it.

A new edition has been published of *The Belief in God and Immortality* of James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology in Bryn Mawr College (Open Court; 12s. net). 'The book,' says the author, 'remains practically what it was; the changes that

have been made are few and none of them of much importance.' _____

There is a new issue of *The Meaning of the Old Testament according to Modern Scholarship*, by the Rev. Hugh Martin, M.A. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). We are right glad to see it. The book is a triumph of scholarship made popular.

In *Impasse or Opportunity* (S.C.M.; 3s. net), Mr. Malcolm Spencer, M.A., discusses 'the situation after Lambeth.' The discussion is certainly not unfriendly, but the way is long.

'I have found that for myself the best way to use the Holy Communion is to concentrate attention on one aspect of its meaning at a time. The ideas which gather round this sacrament are too many and too complex for me to appreciate them all at any one service. I have therefore formed the habit of taking one idea, or set of ideas, each time I go to a celebration, and I concentrate attention on that single aspect and try to fathom its meaning. The result has been so valuable to me that I have written down seven of those aspects, or sets of ideas, in the hope that what has helped me may possibly be of value to others.'

That is the meaning of *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, by the Rev. R. L. Pelly, M.A., Vice-Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta (S.C.M.; 1s. net).

Miracles of Scriptural Foreknowledge, compiled by William Harper, M.A., B.D. (Simpkin; 2s. net), is a small compact volume on the fulfilment of prophecy. There is much in it that is acceptable and profitable; there is a little that is not. "The number of the beast" is "the number of a man," and is 666. The language is Greek, and so the letters of the name equivalent to 666 must be Greek letters, and the name thus formed must be that of a man. The only "name" that fits all the conditions is Lateinus in Greek, written in Latin as Latinus, who was the first king of Latium, in Italy, and the country of the Latin people. This

interpretation harmonises perfectly with all the other identifications of the beast as the Latin clergy.'

The leap in the last sentence is too long.

To the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' has been added *Tractate Sukkah*, according to the text of the *editio princeps* of the Mishna published at Naples in 1492, with the Hebrew commentary of Maimonides. There is included (printed for the first time) the text of the Tosefta after the British Museum MS. The editor is A. W. Greenup, St. John's Hall, Highbury (2s. 6d. net).

Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., has edited and translated the Berakoth of the Mishna and the Berakoth of the Tosefta in one convenient volume. The title is *Tractate Berakoth (Benedictions): Mishna and Tosefta* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). The Introduction contains a short statement of the chief theories which have been held of the relation between the Mishna and the Tosefta. Of wider interest is the section on the light which the Mishna throws on the religion of Palestine in the time of Christ.

A new edition of Bigg's *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* has been prepared by the Right Rev. Arthur John Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). The new edition was necessary. Dr. Bigg's date has not been received, and with the date much else has had to go. The Bishop of Moray is a scholar of high reputation and without bias. While Dr. Bigg regarded the Didache as a fourth-century romance, Dr. Maclean holds, and we think proves, that it is a trustworthy writing of the very beginning of the second century. He believes (and again we think he proves), against Dean Armitage Robinson, that the document gives a true picture of Christian life at that time, but in a remote area. 'It exhibits, probably, a community of Christians hardly influenced by the writings of St. Paul (except one Epistle) or of St. John, but much influenced by the First Gospel; a community with a very meagre conception of the deepest truths of Christianity.'

The Earliest Witness to the Gospel Story.

BY THE REVEREND D. M. M'INTYRE, GLASGOW.

'THE Word became flesh, and dwelt among us': this is the living centre of the Christian belief. God has entered into history: the Eternal has revealed Himself in time. In this seeming paradox there is no contradiction, for the finite may receive the infinite, man may possess God.

The manifestation of Christ is an assured fact of history; every line of evidence demonstrates His existence. But the exact correspondence of the Evangelic portrait with the One portrayed is to some a matter of doubt. The antithesis is sometimes drawn between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. Occasionally we are asked, quite bluntly, to choose—'Jesus or Christ.'

It is frequently alleged that, as a considerable range of time stretches between the events narrated in the Gospel records, there is room for modification, enlargement, idealization. Various answers might be opposed to such an assertion. We might point to the process of Christ through the centuries, as He journeys on His beneficent way, healing, comforting, ennobling—'the Holiest among the mighty, and the Mightiest among the holy.' We might also offer our personal witness to His grace and truth, saying with the Psalmist, 'Come and hear, all ye that fear God; and I will declare what he has done for my soul.' But now we shall restrict ourselves to this reply: No such interval as is imagined does intervene between the life of Jesus and its commemoration—no dark 'tunnel,' where faith stumbles and is afraid. The sequence is unbroken, the history runs without arrest; whereas it is true that, in their completed form, the Gospels belong to the second half of the first Christian century, the scenes and sayings which they record come to us straight from the days of Christ.

In the opening section of the Acts, terminating, let us say, at the eighteenth verse of the eleventh chapter, we have a reliable history of the earliest years of the Church's story. The most conspicuous event in this period is the conversion of Saul. We are not able to date this remarkable occurrence with any exactness. Harnack puts it within a year of the crucifixion; Sir W. M. Ramsay thinks that three years may have elapsed; Bishop Light-

foot suggests four years; Zahn adds one year more. Let us suppose, then, that the annals of the early Church contained in these eleven chapters are mainly concerned with a period of little more than five years.

The question before us is: What is the witness of those years, as conveyed in these chapters, to the facts contained in the Four Gospels?

We may rely on the accuracy of Luke as an historian. He claims, and with reason, to be 'accurate in all things, from the first.' Wendt acknowledges that the Acts of the Apostles is 'an historical work of invaluable worth.' Sir W. M. Ramsay says emphatically, 'Luke's history has been unsurpassed in respect of its trustworthiness.' 'You may press the works of Luke,' he goes on to say, 'beyond any other historian's and they stand the keenest scrutiny and the hardest treatment.' Dr. Knowling, in his three courses of the Boyle Lecture, tests each point of the narrative in turn, and finds that every affirmation rings true. This is, as a little reflexion will show, a very searching test, for in the thirty years embraced by the Acts the scene of the Apostle's labours shifts from one land to another; frequent political changes occur; ancient customs pass; titles, forms of procedure, modes of worship, change from page to page—and yet the narrator (we have confidence in saying) has not been detected in a single error. On the contrary, a considerable number of supposed blunders have been proved, after full examination, to be accurate statements of fact.¹

Some things we may test for ourselves.

At the time when Luke wrote, the organization of the Church had become much more complex than it was in the early days of which he is the historian; but nothing of this intrudes into the narrative.

The doctrinal pronouncements, too, had become more carefully articulated, but in these chapters we meet only a simple, heart-full devotion to the Redeemer, which is content, apart from argumentative statement, to fill heaven and earth with His name.

Nor can we say that the historian has idealized

¹ R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, xiv f.

the Church of the first days. The beauty of holiness that rested upon it is certainly displayed, but it is displayed in an honest narration which conceals no fault. We read of Ananias and Sapphira within the Christian Society, of Simon Magus a professed convert, of murmurings among the widows who received the Church's bounty, and of the narrow spirit of Judaism which drew apart from other believers and sharply censured the apostle of the circumcision himself.

One point is important. When Luke is writing without dependence on others, as in the preface to his Gospel or in the later travel-narratives in the Acts, he writes fluent Greek of the classical mode; in other places his language is coloured according to the authorities which he follows. In the chapters before us, for example, every page is sprinkled with Aramaisms. From this we conclude that he had before him an early Palestinian source, and that he adhered to it with such scrupulous fidelity as to reproduce its very idiom and lexical peculiarities.

Another consideration will appeal to every reader. The New Testament writers were serious men, profoundly impressed with the importance of the revelation that had been entrusted to them. It came to them as spirit and truth, and they affirmed it with utter truthfulness, believing also that they wrote under the guidance and by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Now let us ask—What are the points of contact between these chapters and the four canonical Gospels?

I.

In the first place, we have an outline of the life of our Lord which corresponds in every particular with the Gospel narrative.

Jesus was of Nazareth, son of Mary, and one of several brothers. He was baptized by John in Jordan, receiving from the Father the unction of spirit and power. He chose twelve disciples (their names are given). Eleven were Galileans; these all remained faithful. Judas, the twelfth, betrayed Him. By this disciple the captors of Jesus were guided; for this act of treachery he received a reward, and afterwards perished miserably. Jesus went about doing good. He healed many who were sick. He was prophet and teacher. The Messianic predictions of the Old Testament were all fulfilled in Him; in particular the prophecy

of the Servant of Jehovah. He was condemned by Caiaphas and the rulers of Israel. He was tried by Herod, was sentenced by Pilate. The Roman judge wished to discharge him, but, yielding to clamour, handed Him over to the executioners. Barabbas, a murderer, was preferred to Him. He was crucified, was raised from the dead, showed Himself alive to His disciples, ate with them. In the Spirit He commanded His followers to bear His name to the ends of the earth, but charged them to tarry in Jerusalem till they should be clothed upon with power from on high. During forty days He instructed them in things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. His return having been foretold, He was received up into heaven.

II.

Let us, in the second place, examine a number of allusions contained in these chapters to certain events that are recorded in the Gospels. Some of these are easily recognizable, others are less evident. But the cumulative impression is that the early chapters of the Acts are in complete accord with the evangelic records.

The false witnesses suborned in the trial of Stephen alleged: 'We have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place.' This is precisely the accusation levelled against the Master in the house of Caiaphas. Those false witnesses go on to say, 'And change the customs which Moses delivered unto us.' For this allegation they had better reason, as the disciples themselves had come to understand that when our Lord drew a distinction between ceremonial purification and the purifying of the spirit, He was 'making all meats clean' (Mk 7¹⁹). Peter, in his visit to the house of Cornelius, acted upon the principle then laid down by the Lord.

Both in the Acts and in the Gospels baptism and the gift of the Spirit are associated. In the house of Cornelius the apostle demanded, 'Can any man forbid water, that these who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we, should not be baptized?' Afterwards, defending his course of action, Peter quotes one of the sayings of Christ: 'I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' These verses recall Mt 3¹¹ and Lk 24⁴⁰. They also suggest the inward significance of the ordinance of baptism as instituted by Christ and administered

by the disciples (Mt 28¹⁹; cf. Ac 2⁴¹ 8¹² 13. 38 9¹⁸ 10⁴⁸).

The accustomed meeting-place of the disciples, after the Lord's departure, was 'the upper room'; and a ritual act, common among them, and regarded as of primary importance, was 'the breaking of bread.' Thus we are reminded of the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Simon Peter, addressing the circle of Annas and Caiaphas, assured them there is none other name under heaven that is given among men wherein we must be saved. May he not have had in remembrance the words of Jesus: 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me'? Again Peter says with reference to the condemnation of the Lord, 'I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.' Does not this suggest to our mind the first word from the Cross, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do'? Once more: 'This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which was made the head of the corner'—what is this but the echo of our Saviour's quotation from the Psalter, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner'?

The historian tells us that a field was purchased with the blood-money paid to Judas. This is in full accordance with the account given in the first Gospel. There it is described as the potter's field, and is called *Aceldama*.

In Samaria Philip preaches *Christ*; to the Ethiopians he preaches *Jesus* (8⁵ 35). The Ethiopian probably knew little of Israel's hope, but the narrative in Acts reminds us of the interest taken in the advent of the Messiah, both by the woman of Sychar and by the men whom she summoned to meet Him (Jn 4²⁵ 29).

The account of the laying out of the sick in beds and couches in the streets of Jerusalem, in the expectation of the passing of Peter, leads one to suppose that he had often described to his Jerusalem audiences the events of the evening of that memorable day, Christ's first Sabbath in Capernaum, when it seemed as if all the city had been gathered together at the door of his lowly dwelling (Ac 5¹⁵, Mk 1³²; cf. Mk 6⁵⁶).

Stephen's manner of citation from the Old Testament recalls the walk to Emmaus, when, beginning from Moses and all the prophets, Jesus interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. Precisely the same method

was observed by our Lord when, in the upper room, He reminded them that 'All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me.' It is worth remarking that Paul's sermon in Antioch of Pisidia followed a similar line of selection.

In some of his miraculous works Peter evidently imitated the manner of Christ. In the raising of Dorcas, for instance, we are reminded of the bringing again to life of the daughter of Jairus: 'Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed; and turning to the body, he said, *Tabitha cumi*.'

The impression of the greatness of Jesus and the power of His passion left on the mind of Stephen is evidenced by his dying testimony: 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God . . . Lord Jesus, receive my spirit . . . Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' He dies upon the very words of Christ.

One might add other instances illustrating the statements already made—that the believers, in those first years of the faith, frequently referred, not to the Gospels, for these as yet were non-existent, but to the story which the Evangelist later committed to writing; and that the two records, the Acts and the Gospels, are in fullest harmony with each other. But these examples may suffice.

III.

A third point to which we shall direct notice is, the identity of the view entertained of our Lord's Person and Mission with that which was announced by Christ Himself and reproduced in the Gospels.

The resurrection of the Redeemer, His return to the Father, His session at the right hand of God, and His coming again in glory, were predicted by Himself, and witnessed to by the Apostles. If the two lines of teaching were placed in parallel columns, the similarity would be very striking. It is evident that the Apostles affirm these truths on the authority of their Master.

It was by the ascended Saviour that the gift of the Spirit was dispensed, even as He had said, 'If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you' (cf. 1⁴ 5 2³⁹). How great must He be who is empowered to commission the Holy Ghost!

The departing Saviour assured His people that, though He might seem to leave them, He would surely remain with them all the days, even to the end. And in the history we are informed that it was He who added to the number of His worshipping people such as were being saved; by His power the lame man at the Gate Beautiful was restored to strength. It was He who received the spirit of the departing Stephen, instructed Ananias regarding Saul of Tarsus, made Æneas whole. At every call of duty, in every hour of danger, the disciples felt the touch of 'the hand of the Lord upon them.' He enters so fully into the life of His people, that they and He are one—'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?'

The exalted majesty of the Lord Jesus filled the thoughts of the first preachers of the gospel. Paul begins his ministry with the unhesitating affirmation that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He is, replies Simon, the Author of life, the Lord of all, the Judge of quick and dead. His return in the power of the Father is to be the signal for the restitution of all things.¹ Collectively and individually His people offer to Him the tribute of praise and the homage of worship.

¹ 9²⁰ 3¹⁵ 10⁸⁶. 42 3²⁰. 21.

Thanksgiving, petition, adoration are addressed to Him. All these affirmations find their warrant in the Gospels.

This glorious One is the Saviour, and the only Saviour, of men. He is the sole Object of faith, the preacher's constant Theme. Remission of sins is in His name and by His gift. The largest, freest proclamations of salvation are made on His behalf: 'Unto you first, God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.'

Language could scarcely go further: the Johannean theology is latent in the history of the first days: the Gospels are certified in advance.

In a word, the conclusion that is pressed upon us by these considerations is, that, between the life of Jesus as it was lived and the record of it in the Gospels, there is no place for any 'idealization' of the Lord's earthly ministry; neither is there opportunity for the formation of 'myth' or 'legend.' All that the Evangelists have to say of the greatness of the Redeemer was said in the years immediately subsequent to His death. Indeed, we may safely assert that the main stream of Gospel testimony was flowing unhindered in the Church in the year in which Jesus died.

A Singular Reading of Codex B justified.

By J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., MANCHESTER.

IN 1 Co 8⁶, where St. Paul is explaining the right attitude of Christian believers towards idols and idol-feasts, he makes the statement that 'although there are many so-called gods in heaven and on earth, gods many and lords many, yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we are for Him—and one Lord, to wit, Jesus Christ, by whom (δὲ ὄν) are all things, and we are by Him (δὲ αὐτοῦ).' The reader of the Greek New Testament, who begins to study these rhythmically parallel sentences, will find on the margin of his text in Westcott and Hort's edition the suggestion of a various reading; instead of 'by whom,' it is suggested that we read 'for whom,' *i.e.* δὲ ὄν instead of δὲ οὗ. The change is microscopical as regards the letters of the text, and not very violent as regards the meaning. On looking into the reason for the suggested change,

we see that it is a case of the Codex Vaticanus (B) against all the rest of the Greek MSS., and, of course, if Hort's dictum that 'no readings of Codex B can safely be neglected' be correct, the variant ought to be transferred from the margin into the text. It is interesting to be able to show that, whatever the general value of the dictum may be, it is in the present case correctly applied. We are going to justify the marginal reading by some curious considerations, which have never been applied before to the determination of the value of a various reading. We must go somewhat far afield in our inquiry, but the labour will not be lost.

In a recent issue of the *Rylands Library Bulletin*² we discussed the reaction of Stoic formulæ upon the Book of *Wisdom* directly, and

² *Loc. cit.*, January 1922.

through the Book of *Wisdom* on the text of St. John indirectly. The special field of study was the seventh chapter of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, in which it has, for a long while, been suspected that the terms of Stoic Pantheism were latent. It was shown that the Stoic preacher made great use of philological arguments, that he derived Zeus from ζῆν ('to live'), and Athena from the Æther; and that he was not content with explaining Zeus in the nominative case, but that he took the oblique cases and argued that the forms Dios and Dia contained the Greek preposition διὰ, and that the reason for this lay in the fact that Zeus was the one by whom (δι' οὗ) are all things, and for whom (δι' οὗ) are all things. We were brought at once face to face with the passage He 2¹⁰, in which it is said that it was proper for God, *through whom* are all things and *for whom* are all things, in bringing many souls to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings! It was pointed out that God is here described in Stoic terms; what is said of Him is what the Stoics said of Zeus. This of itself is an important discovery. It was further observed that when the Stoic teacher enunciated his doctrine of God in general terms, he would say that Zeus was Cause and Lord, αἰτίας and κύριος, the first term being a

translation of 'by whom,' the second an equivalent of 'for whom.' It is not necessary to reiterate the quotations from Stoic teachers which justify the foregoing statement. Let us now bear the foregoing facts in our mind and examine, in the light of them, the passage in 1 Co 8, from which we made our departure. We are told that there is one Lord, to wit, Jesus Christ. Ought we to add, 'by whom are all things,' or 'for whom are all things.' Either statement is correct in N.T. theology, but which of them is proper to the definition of Christ as κύριος? The Stoic parallel is emphatic; if Christ is Lord, then the proper term to apply is δι' οὗ, as in the margin of W.-H. and in the Vatican Codex. B is justified.

And now notice one more curious point, which comes to light from the Stoic formulæ. St. Paul knows that δι' οὗ and δι' οὗ belong together; so he goes on, 'and we also by him.' That is the equivalent of δι' οὗ. The ordinary text misses the shade of difference in the two pronominal uses of διὰ, and turns the sentence into a mere repetition. We infer, then, that the marginal reading of W.-H. in 1 Co 8⁶ should be restored to the text, and, at the same time, we register the influence of Stoic theology upon the diction and thought of the Apostle.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Yawning.

'When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man.'—Mt 12⁴².

You know what it means to yawn, don't you? What happens in the morning when they waken you; and you feel you have hardly been asleep at all; and your eyes won't keep open, rub at them how you will; and you stretch, and stretch, and better stretch; and your head feels as if it were going to fall into two halves, and the top bit fly off: or in the evening when you're feeling sleepy, and your mouth won't keep shut, but opens of itself, ever deeper, ever wider, ever broader. Well, that's to yawn.

And if you are a polite boy, or a decent kind of girl, you put up your hand to your mouth when you do it. Why? Because mother, if you didn't,

would see, and pack you off to bed. But you do it, surely, even if mother isn't there. Why? Because it is the proper thing to do. But why is it the proper thing to do? Because every one does it, when they yawn. But why do they do it? You don't know.

Well, I will tell you why. The editor of this paper has just finished a huge book about all kinds of things in twelve big volumes. And in the twelfth we are told, among other things, all about yawning. You put your hand up to your mouth in order that an evil spirit mayn't pop in, and down into your heart and live there. That's why, and a very good reason too. Long ago people thought the world was full of evil spirits, like this one Jesus tells us about; and some of them were lonely and homeless, and they wandered up and down, and to and fro, looking for some

place where they might live; and when they saw an open mouth, 'Why! here's the very place,' they said, 'this will make a right cosy, comfortable, little nest, and in they popped; and, once in, who was going to get them out again? And so people, when they yawn, put up their hands, and guard their mouths, and say to those horrid little ugly devils, 'No, you don't!' and keep them out.

You don't believe that! Ah, well, there's no doubt about it there are lots and lots of evil spirits wandering about, and you had better take care of them. And I can prove it. The other day you were playing a game, quite happily, and some one hacked you on the shin, and tripped you up. And why! Whatever has happened? Where is the decent wee lad who was playing here a moment back? And where did this little fury come from, with its blazing eyes, and its tongue and its fists going?

Dear me! when you opened your mouth to say what you thought about it, you must have forgotten to put up your hand, and the devil of Bad Temper has slipped in. What a pity it is! and what will we do now?

Or, the other day on the street, I passed a girl tossing her head, and walking away from her companions, and shouting across her shoulder, in a high, shrill voice, 'It's not fair, Mary Ann, I won't play.' 'Oh,' said I when I saw her, 'here's a girl been yawning, and she didn't put up her hand, and the evil spirit of Sulks has seen its chance and in it has hopped. And how disappointed her mother will be when she sees, not her own girl's face at all, but this cross, peevish, angry one—Sulk's face.'

Yes, there are lots of evil spirits in the world—some come in through our eyes like envy, or through our ears like horrid, nasty talk, but most of them come in by our mouths, and down into our hearts they go, and what a mess they make of it!

And how are we to get them out? It's quite true, you say, I am sulky, and I am bad tempered. I don't mean it; but I can't remember, and before I know, it's just happened again.

Well, Jesus tells us how to get them out—the horrid, clumsy, ugly things that go tramping about our hearts, soiling and dirtying them, writing up their nasty jests upon the walls, and sprawling there quite at their ease. And though it's our heart, and not theirs, yet we can't turn them out.

Jesus tells us that there aren't only evil spirits in

the world. But there's a Holy Spirit too, far bigger and far stronger than any of them, or than all of them, who is on our side, who wants to help us. And if we can get Him in our heart, He will throw out the other unclean ones, and put our hearts to rights again, and will live there Himself, and not let them come back again.

And how are we to get Him, this big, strong, splendid friend of ours? Well, Jesus tells that too.

He says we have a Father, the very nicest and kindest and dearest Father any one ever had. He is so good to us that He is always, always, always giving us splendid things, and thinking out more splendid things, and all for us. He gave you mother—the nicest mother ever was; He gave you health, and home, and school, and friends, and games, and books, and Saturdays, and holidays. He gave you everything you have. He has kept back nothing. He gave you even Jesus Christ; and, says Christ, if we ask Him He will give us this great Friendly Spirit to dwell in our hearts, and keep them clean for us; if we just tell Him that we are cross, and sulky, and bad-tempered, and dreadfully lie-a-bed in the morning, and awfully apt to skip our lessons, and can't help it, He'll say, 'Poor little man,' or 'Poor wee wifie,' you need some one to help you, and here He is.

And so I think you should go to your Father, and climb up on His knee and put your arms about His neck, and ask Him for the Holy Spirit now. If you do, says Christ, He will give Him to you. And Christ always keeps His word.

Who is King?

'I will be king.'—1 Kings 1⁵.

Last month we were talking of how to become princes. This month I want to tell you how to be a king. And here is a splendid text that looks as if it had just been made for us. 'I will be king.'

But I don't want you to try to be a king in the way that the man who spoke those words tried to be a king. His name was Adonijah, and he was one of the sons of David, king of Israel. He knew that his brother Solomon was to be king when David their old father died, but he plotted and planned in an underhand way to get himself made king in Solomon's stead. I'm glad to say his wicked scheme failed, and in the end he

had humbly to beg his very life at Solomon's hands.

Now, although Adonijah had no right to say 'I will be king,' you and I have a right to say it. For, wonderful to relate, we—you and I—are called to be kings. You can be a king, and I can be a king.

How can that be?

Well, it's like this. God sent you and me into this world, and when He sent us here He put into each of us a little bit of Himself, a little bit of His own Divine Nature, a something that is splendid and noble and good. And that little bit of God in us is the true part of us, the kingly part. Sometimes it gets almost buried out of sight beneath mounds of thoughtlessness, or selfishness, or meanness, or even cruelty. But it is there all the time. God never loses sight of it. He is always trying hard to help us to give that bit of Himself a chance to come to the top. For God means us all to be kings. Never forget that. He sees the king in every one of us, where others perhaps see nothing but what is ugly or unpleasant. He sees the king in every one of us, and He is always calling us to be worthy of our kingship.

What does it mean to be a real king? It is not pomp and splendour that make a king, but the kingly heart within.

And first, a true king must be able to govern himself. There was a king once in Macedonia who set out to conquer the world. He marched to Persia, to India, to Egypt, and when he returned in triumph he wept because there were no worlds to conquer. But though Alexander the Great conquered the world, he never learned to conquer himself. In a fit of temper he threw a spear at a dearly loved friend and slew him, and he ended his days as a drunkard.

There was a prince who was almost a king, for he married the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and helped her to rule wisely and well. When good Prince Albert came of age he wrote in a letter, 'I am now twenty-one, and so I am my own master, and I hope always to continue to be so.' He meant that he hoped always to be able to control and govern himself. He succeeded so well that he earned the title of Albert the Good. And when he died the whole nation mourned for him as for a friend.

A true king must learn to govern, and we are not worthy of our kingship if we are allowing our

petty tempers or our greedy passions to get the better of us.

Again, a true king never stoops to anything mean or low. If you feel tempted to do anything unfair, or spiteful, or degrading, say to yourself, 'No, I can't. I'm a king, and a king is too noble for that.' Act always with kingly courage, with kingly honour. Never forget you are a king.

But we could never have hoped to be real kings unless Jesus Christ, the King of kings, had come into the world and showed us how. He looked down from heaven and saw men fighting with themselves and playing a losing game. And He said I will go down and help them, I will show them that God loves them and that He is on their side. I will fight their enemy the devil and conquer him. I will do what they cannot do for themselves—I will carry their sins for them, carry them to the Cross, so that the guilt and the power of sin may be broken for ever. I will loose them from their sins so that they may become kings unto God and reign with Him on earth.

And He came down to this world and lived among men and women. He looked into their hearts and He saw good where other men saw only evil. And when He had fought the fight they were too weak to fight with themselves, and had conquered sin and death, He went to reign with God for ever.

He is still looking on as we fight, but never again need we be beaten, for He has broken the power of sin and He will give us strength to conquer. So don't lose heart, boys and girls, never lose heart. Remember Jesus knows all about it, He sees the king in you and He is on the kingly side.

And one thing more. If we are faithful to our kingship here, we shall one day go to reign with Christ above.

The eldest son of the Duke of Hamilton lay dying. If he had lived he would one day have succeeded to the dukedom, but now his young brother would be the heir. As he lay there he called his brother to him. And this is what he said, 'I am going to die. You will be the duke now, but—I shall be a king!'

'He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne.' That is what Jesus says, boys and girls, and He never breaks a promise.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Sufferings and the Glory.

'For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.'—Ro 8¹⁸.

Bishop Gore speaking to some of us the other day, implied that it was characteristic of the Bible to face the worst, but always with a sense that the worst was not incurable and that somehow the Christian knew that there was a remedy for the evil, a way out of the confusion and distress. This is so in the great and often-quoted passage in the Epistle to the Romans in which Paul looks out on the sadness of a suffering world. You will have to look a very long way before you match the beauty of that passage.

1. It is wonderfully modern. It breathes a sympathy with Nature which finds expression in any amount of recent poetry. Nature, we think, would resent a good deal of the sympathy that we offer her. It is too like the sympathy we offer one another: it is well meant, but it either goes too far or it falls short. It is too clever by half; or it is too timid. The Old Testament has a marvellous sympathy with the happiness of Nature. The floods clap their hands, the valleys laugh and sing, the hills rejoice before the Lord: but it has less heart for Nature's sorrow. There it is that St. Paul is most wonderful. He gets to the very heart of the sadness of things. He notes how much vanity there is in Nature—how much that is ineffective and disappointing, how much waste and sadness, by reason of the omnipresent law of corruption, dissolution, and decay under which she is laid. He feels this as from Nature's own heart. He has an ear for the universal cry of positive pain, pain as of a woman in travail, which is one at least of the most unmistakable voices of Nature.

This is wonderful, there is nothing like it anywhere else. Many people, even though they cannot put it into words, realize the suffering of the world, they hear the louder and acuter cries of pain, but they miss the quieter symptoms: the half-suppressed sigh, the restlessness, the weariness, the silent despondency of it all. But Paul might have lived in the very heart of Nature, just as he lived a thousand lives in the hearts of those he loved. He has his finger on the pulse of Nature

as surely as he has it on the pulse of Galatia, or Corinth, or Philemon, or Timothy!

2. But Nature is not only suffering. Nature, is expectant. Paul's words, of course, are difficult, for he is dealing with a difficult matter. It might seem as though he were reading into the heart of the dumb or the inanimate Creation the hopes and fears of the human race; or crediting it with some vague surmise of the purpose of God's love. It is subject to 'Vanity,' not willingly, but by reason of Him who has subjected it in hope. It is just possible that even in Instinct (of which we speak as though we knew all about it) there may be qualities we fail to appreciate. I am not sure that I have not seen what you might call a far-away look in the eyes of a dog. It may be more than mere fancy that makes us recognize something like wistfulness, 'unsatisfied desire to understand,' in dumb beasts, some faint echo in their hearts of our own heart's desire. To the mind of Paul, just as Creation is linked in suffering, so too Creation is linked in expectant hope—and the future of Nature is bound up with the future of Man: her hope with ours. But Paul goes further, for he makes the liberation of Nature from this bondage of futility dependent on the liberation of man. Creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, for it is into the glorious liberty of the sons of God that Creation is to be delivered.

Now what all this may mean ultimately, in the last event, in what we call the final consummation, we may be quite unable to imagine. We can see our way to believing that the ultimate manifestation of the sons of God may include the perfect liberation of all there is, and that when they shine as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father, we may have the peace and the glory of a new heaven and a new earth. But the more we know of Religion, the less inclined we are to think of anything as merely, only, exclusively final; as coming *only* at the end. Everything that is to be hereafter, is in some sense here already; Resurrection, Judgment, Eternal Life. Remember the simple words that give the main conclusion of a difficult book: 'Neither an Eternal Life that is already fully achieved here, nor an Eternal Life to be begun and known solely in the beyond, satisfies these requirements (those of Religion). But only an Eternal Life already begun and truly known in part here, though fully to be achieved and com-

pletely to be understood hereafter, corresponds to the deepest longings of man's spirit as touched by the pre-eminent Spirit, God.¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Intolerance.

'We forbade him, because he followeth not with us.'—Lk 9⁴⁹.

If we eliminate the large part played in fostering religious disunion by purely irreligious tempers, which have passed over unmodified from the world into the Church, such as the love of domination, the unwillingness to revise a long-held dogma, or even the intellectual inertia which distrusts all that is unfamiliar, the outstanding balance of responsibility for intolerance and its fruits—and it is not small—may be assigned to the instinctive feeling that one who uses the Master's name, but places a different interpretation upon his character, or work, or authority, is a false friend, and hence must be distrusted.

This was exactly the attitude of the disciples of Jesus, when they abruptly put a stop to the unauthorized activities of one who cast out devils in Jesus' name, but who was not of their company and may, indeed, have known very little of the Master. But non-conformity was no fatal objection in His eyes. Rather He said: 'Do not stop him; no one who performs any miracle in my name will be ready to speak evil of me. He who is not against us is for us.' If we compare this with that other saying, 'He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters,' we can discern three principles, which might be illustrated, if there were any need, from other passages in the Gospels. (i.) There can be no neutrality in the Christian life. (ii.) The test of discipleship lies rather in action than in profession. (iii.) Those at a distance, theologically or ecclesiastically, from ourselves may be nearer the Master than we know. If these tests had always been steadily kept in mind, the Unity of the Spirit would have been far more visible than it has actually been in the history of the Church.

The failure to apply them has taken two closely related forms.

(1) The one noble motive of tolerance has been the feeling that the heretic, who in the Church's judgment distorted or minimized some aspect of

the Incarnation, the Atonement or some other central Christian doctrine, was doing dishonour to Jesus Christ, and so endangering the effectiveness and purity of the Church. But the honour which Jesus Himself sought was above all that of simple obedience; and He would, we may feel sure, wish no other form of pressure applied to the man of imperfect faith than the educative pressure of a growing experience acquired in the endeavour to serve Him. This most certainly was the method of His earthly ministry; and it is well to remember that the Church herself has but very imperfectly understood her Master's character and message.

(2) Granted that every man of strong conviction must seek to defend his deepest beliefs, he may still distinguish between the contrary opinion and its supporter, combating the former without attempting to coerce the latter. The failure to recognize this—to us—obvious distinction has been at the root of all sincere religious persecution. The *odium theologicum* may be said to rest on *ignorantia psychologica*—the ignoring of the fact that change of belief is a process of reason stimulated by emotion. Thus an imperfect belief can only be truly changed (not merely disguised) when he who holds it sees that another belief is more perfect, explains more, or produces a nobler type of character. It was blindness to this fact that made so great a man as Dante place the fierce troubadour-turned-bishop and persecutor, Folquet, in the Third Heaven. Dante, with his intense passion for Unity, felt that the heretics had sought to break the fair Unity of the Church, and so deserved the sternest reprobation; but he, like others in his age, failed to see how largely the fault lay with the Church itself—that the fold into which it summoned men was too narrow to satisfy their varied needs or to represent the comprehensiveness of the Christian calling.

Now that this truth had been learned in part, the way does assuredly open to a greater measure of unity, both inward and outward, in the life of the Church. We can distinguish between Uniformity and Unity, and see that one is a mark of death, while the other embraces all the variety of a life that cannot be repressed. For there must be variety in any society that is rooted, not merely in the past, but in a life-giving soil related alike to past, present, and future. No Church that aims at standardization, either of belief or of ritual, has realized that great saying, 'All things are yours.'

¹ H. L. Paget, *Peace and Happiness*.

But it is easy to see that, while the outward and the inward unity are closely related, the latter is fundamental. An external unification may remain mechanical; but the Unity of the Spirit finds ever new forms for itself, since its organizing power is not that of a programme, but of a Life.

Yet the steady and deliberate pursuit of unity is also needful, for, here as elsewhere, the forces of disunion to be overcome are strong and persistent. This obligation comes home, indeed, to the conscience of our time with especial directness; and we may take as typical the recent utterance of a Free Church leader, who asks whether it is 'more important to seek unity or to be jealous for freedom.' He suggests that the answer to this question 'may well vary from generation to generation. They were right who once put freedom first, and we are right to-day, who, under shell-fire, put Unity first, both in Church and State.'

Nor is the call to 'seek peace and ensue it' limited to the questions that divide the different branches of the Christian Church. It applies within each, as well as among all; and it has a bearing even upon the transaction of Church business. The forms under which such business is carried on may seem unimportant, yet they are not so in reality; for it is reasonable to look for a higher expression of the Unity of the Spirit, even in details of procedure, in the Church's Assemblies than in the parliamentary or municipal sphere. Yet too often the methods of the former are modelled on examples drawn from the latter. Among the many ways in which the Society of Friends can show a notable example to far larger and more elaborately organized churches, not the least is this, that their aim is always to transact business in 'unity,' and even highly controversial matters are never carried to the vote. Long experience has taught Friends that, in reliance upon the guidance of the Spirit, they can always reach a final agreement if they seek for it with sufficient patience and faith. Nor can it be said that this is merely a happy result of the relatively small numbers of the Society, and of the unity of character and ideal which has grown up within its restricted membership: for this aim was clearly set forth by their very earliest leaders, even before the Society had assumed any definite outward organization. Sir Edward Burrough, one of George Fox's first fellow-workers, wrote: 'Being orderly, come together . . . proceed in the wisdom of

God . . . not deciding affairs by the greater vote . . . but in the wisdom, love, and fellowship of God, in gravity, patience, meekness, in unity and concord . . . all things to be carried on: by hearing and determining every matter coming before you, in love, coolness, gentleness, and dear unity; I say as one only party, all for the truth of Christ, and for the carrying on of the work of the Lord, and assisting one another in whatsoever ability God hath given; and to determine of things by a general mutual concord, in assenting together as one man in the spirit of truth and equity, and by the authority thereof.' Through this quaint and loosely-knit language, may we not feel the very breath and atmosphere of St. Paul's words regarding 'the fruit of the Spirit'?

Place beside this echo of the seventeenth century two scenes from the thirteenth. In a loggia opposite the great church of Santa Maria Novella at Florence, there may be seen one of the most beautiful terra-cotta reliefs of the school of Della Robbia. It represents the meeting of St. Dominic and St. Francis; and even the dust from the piazza which has encrusted parts of the relief cannot conceal the tenderness and rapture of the two saints, as the sculptor has depicted them bowing their heads in the fervour of their greeting. Thus is expressed the unity which may bind together two types of service, the intellectual service of Truth, and the practical service of Love, which are too often severed and suspicious, but in reality are complementary, each completing the work of the other.

The traditional scene of this meeting is the northern gate of Perugia, at which we stood only a few hours after seeing Della Robbia's relief. From the gate the traveller looks towards a monastery crowning a hill a few hundred yards off—the scene of another meeting, perhaps more legendary, but even more significant. For it was here, according to the story in the Fioretti, that St. Louis of France came to visit the humble Umbrian peasant saint, Brother Giles, one of the best-loved companions of St. Francis. 'Albeit they ne'er before had seen each other, kneeling down with great devotion they embraced and kissed each other, with such signs of tender love as though for long time they had been close, familiar friends; but for all that, they spoke not, nor the one nor the other.' Then the King departed, and after the Brother had returned, some of the brethren

reproached him. 'O, Brother Giles, why hast thou shown thee so discourteous as to say naught at all to so holy a king, that had come from France to see thee and hear from thy lips good words?' Replied Brother Giles, 'Dear brothers, marvel not thereat, for neither I to him nor he to me could speak a word; sith, so soon as we embraced each other, the light of heavenly wisdom revealed and showed to me his heart and mine to him, and thus through divine working, each looking on the other's heart, we knew what I would say to him and he to me, far better than if we had spoken with our mouths, and with more consolation than if we had sought to show forth in words the feelings of our hearts!'

Legend, these two tales, and poetry, it will be said; yes, but setting forth a double truth more persuasively than argument could do. Men of the most diverse gifts and stations may find unity in a service that is great enough to find room for the gifts of all. And, while Inward Unity may use the widest range of outward expression, yet, at its highest and purest its expression is beyond words, for words are needless to those who know themselves at one.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Stillness.

'Be still, and know that I am God.'—Ps 46¹⁰.

Some one who suffered very much told me that always when you are at the worst of your sufferings and of your despair God seems to forsake you. She said, 'I cannot explain how it is or why it is, but I know it is true. When you get down to the very bottom God leaves you alone.' I suppose most of us who have been in despair, either from suffering or from sin, people who struggled and struggled against some vice, or some weakness, or against circumstances, do feel that God does not really help them; that although they were quite conscious of Him and thought He was there, and believed He was there when they were happy, and even probably when they were a little unhappy, when they are really up against things, when they feel for the thousandth time that everything seems to be against them, God is deaf and blind; He leaves them alone.

Have you ever seen a sick child in the arms of its mother, or watched over by its mother when it

was delirious with fever and pain? If you have seen that you have seen one of the most godlike sights, one of the most moving things in life. The child does not know its mother. She watches it, she listens to every breath, she keeps its little flickering spirit alive during the night and during the chill hours of dawn when life flows so feebly. She gives to it, or she tries to give to it, just what will keep it alive, or bring it relief from pain, or slake its thirst, or allow it to sleep—everything on earth that it is possible to do or relieve pain and to reinforce life she is doing. And all the time her child does not know she is there, and perhaps—and this is one of the most heartrending things I have ever witnessed—it perhaps thrusts her away and dashes from its own lips the medicine that might heal it, the opiate that might bring it sleep, the drink that might slake its thirst. All the while the child cries out for its mother, and in the most heartrending accents it implores her not to abandon it. Some of you have seen such a sight; perhaps I have described one of you who are mothers. Such a mother, if she is wise and strong, never wavers. She knows that the child is turning the knife in the wound every time it thrusts her away or cries out to her to come when in fact she is there; but not for one instant does she leave that child or relax any effort, and if the child lives through the night it was because it was so nursed—for nursing often does much more than medicine. If it were not for her care that little life would have flickered out, and all the time it believes itself abandoned by its mother, who will not hear it cry and will not come to its assistance.

So lies the sick world in the arms of God, who not for an instant leaves it all alone, without whom we should not live—do I say through the night?—without whom we should not live an hour, should not exist, in whom we live and move and have our being; without whom we could not find strength to blaspheme; without whom we should have no voice to reproach Him, no brains with which to reason that He is not there. And all the time we cry out for His help, and thrust from our lips what He would give us, and strike away the arms with which He would sustain us; and it is not possible, as long as we are possessed with delirium and fever, that we should know God.

'Be still, and know that I am God,' is not an

¹ G. F. Barbour, *The Unity of the Spirit*.

arbitrary command, it is a psychological necessity. You cannot see when you are in a hurry; you cannot hear when you are panting with anxiety. You speak to a person who is in a panic, and he does not hear you; you are telling him what to do, and he cannot hear. You see a person in a fit of anxiety, and he cannot see what is before him; he misses everything he looks for. Such people tie up everything into a knot, and cannot untie it, and they get into a frenzy just because they are in a frenzy; they cannot see or hear or act wisely, and cannot know what is wise to do, because they are in such a state of frantic anxiety. The fever, the delirium of their anxiety, makes them cry out for what is there.

There are many proverbs on our lips about 'More haste, less speed,' 'Make haste slowly,' and all those familiar little phrases of common wisdom and sense which prove to you that you cannot be wise when you are anxious. We talk about 'panic legislation'; by that we always mean something bad. We mean that when people are in a frenzy of haste, anxiety, dread, they always do something foolish. This great problem of unemployment dread that is on us now is that somebody will do something absolutely foolish, because we have left it so long that now we are in a state of alarm; and when you are in a state of alarm you cannot do anything really sensible, and your trust in God, which should give you serenity and calm, you lose, because you begin to wonder whether God is really there. You read modern books about Christianity, and you find that a lot of things you believed were true are not true, or people say they are not true. You go to one place and hear one preacher say one thing, and to another place and hear another preacher say quite a different thing, and you get into a theological fluster, and you cannot any longer see God because you are in such a state of anxiety. The fog that we make with our filthy smoke is only on the surface of the earth, but it shuts out the stars; and the noise and bustle of our life shuts them out too.

The reason why our public life is so disordered and our private life so hampered by anxiety is because we cannot be still and know God. All the religious teachers in the world have been saying that over and over again, and yet we do not believe it. It is a natural law that we cannot see or hear or understand when we are in a frantic hurry. When a person gets nervous he cannot do

his best. All the world is nervous to-day. Our problems are not insoluble; neither Russia, nor unemployment here, nor Ireland, nor any other problem you like to mention is insoluble; it is we that stupefy ourselves by our nervousness and terror.

I notice that in one of the accounts of the recent golf competition, between a man and a woman, it was said that: At this point he got rather nervous, owing to the score against him, and began to 'press.' Some of you play golf. I do not; but I have played just enough to know what is meant by 'pressing.' It means you are trying to get just a little beyond what is within your power; you are beginning to play nervously, a little harder than you are equal to. A very eminent psychologist said to me: 'In all departments of life you should learn not to press. Don't be anxious, don't be nervous; the moment you do that you lose your power.'

How is it possible to escape that anxiety? 'Be still, and know that I am God.' He speaks to us, if we would only listen, in beauty, in music, in nature, in the voices of the past, in our own consciousness, in a thousand ways, would we but listen. When people say they cannot pray it is often because instinctively they know that what they want is for once that they should not clamour to God, but that they should hear God speak. Perhaps you have never been trained to listen to the voice of God when you pray; or if you have been trained to it, as Quakers have and some others, even so perhaps in the pressure of anxiety, in the agony of failure, in the torment of suspense and suffering, you lose the power that has been trained in you, you cannot any longer be still enough to hear God. And so you tell me that, at the last, God always deserts you; which means only that you and I, in the extremity of our anxiety, cannot keep still enough—literally, cannot keep still enough—to hear God speak. And yet when we hear music, or see something beautiful, or commune with great souls, we do hear Him; and though we may not call it God, or know that it is God, though we may deplore our inability to see God or hear Him, yet there is in our hearts the unconscious knowledge that where there is beauty or inspiration God is speaking, and then at last we may be silent and listen to the Divine voice.¹

¹ A. Maude Royden, in the *Christian World Pulpit*.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Christian Justice.

'Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 5²⁰.

The modern word is justice. Read it so: 'Except your justice exceed the justice of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven.' That sentence strikes the keynote of the Sermon on the Mount. It is the manifesto of a new kind of justice, the justice of the Kingdom, of the ideal society—a justice not legal but personal, not negative but positive, not retributive but redemptive, a justice whose standard is not a dead law, but the character of a living Person, the God whom Jesus called Father. It is simple truth to say that one of the chief reasons why Jesus angered and scandalized the Pharisees was because His standard of justice clashed with theirs. His idea of the moral order was radically different from theirs, which is just another way of saying that He had a different conception of God. They thought of God primarily as a Judge transcendent and remote, who dealt with men on the basis of a written law. Though doubtless among the 'pious and quiet' of the land the sense of God's unmerited grace and loving-kindness, as it meets us in many of the Psalms, lived on, yet the legal way of thinking certainly predominated. Those who kept the Law scrupulously looked for a future reward as of right, while they regarded those who 'knew not the law' as objects of God's retributive judgment. 'This people who knoweth not the law is accursed.' For them was reserved the 'outer darkness,' while the true sons of Abraham would sit at the banquet in the Kingdom of God. Such being their view of the justice of God, their view of justice among men naturally corresponded with it. It was hard and external, lacking in depth and humanity, as we see in a story like that of the woman taken in adultery. It is against such a background of moral and religious feeling that we must set the teaching of Jesus concerning the justice of the Kingdom, if we would grasp its full significance.

The teaching of Jesus found its beginning, middle, and end in the thought of God as a Father, whose love goes forth to good and evil, just and unjust alike, who offers to all men the gift of sonship in His Kingdom. This new view

of God necessarily involved a 'transvaluation' of all moral and religious values. It cannot be insisted upon too often that what we have in the Sermon on the Mount is an ethic based upon religion, a morality rooted in theology. We simply cannot understand the ethic, let alone practise it, apart from the conception of the character of God, in which it stands rooted. The new kind of justice, which is the burden of the Sermon on the Mount, is just a reflexion, a copy of God the Father's justice. It is only possible to those who have entered on their sonship. The moral end Jesus sets before men is a character like God's. This is explicitly stated, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' The motive suggested for the new way of life is 'that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven,' and the characteristic of the Father held up for imitation is precisely His indiscriminating beneficence, 'for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.' True morality is Godlikeness; it is no more possible to separate the morality of Jesus from His religion, His way of life from His faith in God the Father, than it is to separate the convex and the concave of the same curve.

What, then, is the chief burden of Jesus' teaching about justice? The crucial question concerns the treatment of the evil-doer. It is here that the character of retributive justice finds its clearest expression. There is much in the Sermon on the Mount and the other teaching of Jesus about the truly 'just' attitude to the wrong-doer. It seems to us deeply significant that it is in a collection of sayings whose keynote is *δικαιοσύνη*, justice, that the teaching concerning forgiveness, love to enemies, non-resistance to evil, occurs. These are given as examples of a justice (*δικαιοσύνη*) more abundant, which goes beyond that prescribed by the religious authorities of the day. It is as if Jesus said, 'Yet show I unto you a more excellent way' of justice, not weaker but stronger, not easier but harder, than what you have practised hitherto. This new justice of the Kingdom, which Jesus enjoins upon His followers, is not concerned about exacting due penalty, but, going further and deeper, sets about overcoming the evil at its root by forgiveness and outgoing goodwill. The eye of Jesus is always on the soul. He seems to have regarded the evil act as a very small thing compared with

the evil will, the wrong disposition, 'the lie in the soul.' If the will could be turned from evil to good, if the inward darkness could be changed to light, if the mind could be changed, which is what 'repentance' means, that was the real victory. In order to bring this about, to 'gain a brother,' the child of the Kingdom would count no price of patient endurance or suffering too great to pay. The way of forgiveness and ungrudging service is the hardest, but it is also the surest, way of overcoming evil in the secret place of character, in the fastnesses of personality, where it lies entrenched. The stronghold that will resist all the assaults of punishment will surrender at the summons of forgiving love. The justice which goes 'the extra mile' gets to the heart of the enemy's country, beyond those defences which baffle the justice of repression.

This way of fighting evil is only very inadequately described as non-resistance. That term has come to be associated with a certain moral flabbiness and lack of zeal for goodness, with an easy acquiescence in wrong. Nothing could be further from the truth as set forth by Jesus. The attitude towards evil-doing, enjoined and practised by Him, is one that demands the utmost strength and courage. It is, in fact, only possible to one who has such an intense passion for goodness and belief in its victorious power that he is prepared to go any length, even the length of suffering, in order to overcome evil at its 'base.' No one who reads the Sermon on the Mount with an open mind can doubt that the religion of Jesus is a revolutionary faith, a warrior religion with the Hymn of Love for its Marseillaise and the Cross for its oriflamme. The way of repression and punishment is negative justice, justice remaining on the defensive. The justice of Jesus, often scorned under the inadequate title non-resistance, is positive, militant, justice taking the offensive. It is at once the most courageous and the most radical way of fighting evil. It does not merely drive the enemy back to his trenches, whence he will soon issue for another attack of added fierceness, it pursues him to his 'base,' and makes him surrender there. It is justice with a heart on fire, heroic, 'never despairing,' bent on victory at any cost—which is sketched for us in those brief, paradoxical sentences, 'half-battles,' of the Sermon on the Mount. It goes the second mile, while the world's justice goes but one. It is not easier but

harder, not less but more tolerant of wrong, not less but more in love with what is right, than the justice of the Pharisee both in the ancient and the modern world. Such justice is only possible to those who believe that God wills it, and that therefore 'the unconquered and unconquerable forces' are on the side of those who try to practise it. If we believe in the same God as the Pharisees, we cannot possibly practise the heroic justice of the Sermon on the Mount. The moral dynamic would be lacking, for in that case the moral order would not be for us, but against us.

There is no escape from the conclusion that Jesus had a fundamentally different view of the moral order from that of the Pharisees and of contemporary Judaism. They held that God dealt with men, and consequently that men ought to deal with one another, on a legal basis—so much merit so much reward, so much sin so much punishment. The teaching of Jesus moves on a different plane, is pitched in a different key altogether. For Him there is no question of grace being withheld or reconciliation postponed until satisfaction has been made or due outward penalty exacted. He knows that sin cannot fail to bring its own inward penalty. The justice of legal retribution is transcended. Justice more abundant, in the shape of unmerited goodwill, goes out to meet the sinner, and evokes within him a change of mind—repentance.

It is not repentance that creates His willingness to forgive; on the contrary, it is His eternal readiness to forgive that creates repentance. We repent, even as we love, 'because He first loved us.' Repentance is the fruit rather than the condition of God's love. Is not the crowning wonder of the Gospel that God takes the initiative, that He comes more than half-way to meet the sinner, and by such forth-running, unmerited kindness brings about that moral revolution, that turning of the heart from evil to good, which we call repentance? 'The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' He is like the shepherd seeking his lost sheep, like the woman hunting for her lost coin. He seeks until He finds. This aspect of the truth finds classical expression in Francis Thompson's poem, 'The Hound of Heaven.' 'Fear wist not to evade as Love wist to pursue.' When we speak of repentance as the condition of forgiveness, we are apt to create the impression that love is a passive, limited

thing, instead of the active, redeeming energy which in fact it is. The whole meaning of love is that it is unconditioned, 'making its sun to shine on the evil and the good, and sending rain on the just and unjust.' Love is essentially creative. It is unsatisfied until it has reproduced its own

likeness in the sinner and made him in his turn a source of forgiveness and redemption to others. It is impossible to be forgiven in any real sense without being oneself ready to forgive. Forgiveness is bound to issue in forgiving-ness.¹

¹ N. L. Robinson, *Christian Justice*.

The Forensic Interpretation of the Cross.

BY THE REVEREND A. M. POPE, B.D., MONTREAL.

IN past ages of Church History the Apostle Paul held a place of the highest honour among religious thinkers, as the great creative genius who gave definite intellectual expression to the simple gospel message of the Nazarene. But in our own day the apostle to the Gentiles has passed under a cloud, and has been the subject of much unfavourable criticism. He has been denounced as the man who led the infant Church along devious paths, as the guilty party who sowed tares among the wheat of our Lord's own planting. The creeds of Christendom have been built upon Pauline and Johannine metaphysics, and these useless paraphernalia, we are informed, have blinded the eyes of religious teachers to the beauty and importance of the simple ethic of Jesus. The cry to-day has been, 'Back to Christ.' To a certain extent, one cannot but sympathize with this desire. Anything that tends to bring the Church into closer and more vital relationship with the person of her living Redeemer is worthy of all praise. The cry is an evidence that we are becoming more and more conscious that the secret, the power, and the charm of the gospel lie, not in the explanations which have been given of the incarnation of our Lord, but in the fact itself as it is vividly portrayed for us in the moving narratives of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. The human Jesus as He walked and lived among men is coming into His own place of pre-eminence. We are realizing to-day as never before, that the greatest of the apostles must stand on a spiritual and moral plane inferior to that of the Crucified. Yet whilst all this is true, let us not forget that we receive from St. Paul an essential contribution to Christian knowledge, a contribution which in the very nature of things we could not expect to

get from the synoptic records. The historical Jesus, despite the beauty of His character and winsomeness of His personality, could not exert His mighty influence over the minds and hearts of men, did we not know that He can still come into intimate relationship with ourselves as the Christ of experience. And the knowledge that this experience can be ours comes to us at first hand in the glowing passionate words of the apostle, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'

To understand the rough handling which the man of Tarsus has received at the hands of historical criticism, it is only necessary to run over some of the mental portraits of St. Paul which have been current during the past century. We have the popular idea of the narrow, bigoted, fanatical Jew, who was transformed by his experience on the road to Damascus into the preacher of a world-wide universal religion. We have St. Paul delineated to us as the great liberator of Christianity from the trammels of Judaism, and we have seen him pictured as the man who bound the simple message of Jesus with the fetters of Greek thought. We have him described as the man of creative intellect, who gave the new religion thought habiliments in keeping with its intrinsic worth, and we have him set forth as a mere eclectic, borrowing wholesale from the mystery religions and other cults. We have known him as the exponent of free spiritual religion, and we have his picture as a high sacramentarian glorifying baptism and the eucharist. We find Paul preaching the redemption of the body, and yet have him characterized as the despiser of all things physical. We have him conceived as a believer in material apocalyptic expectations, and yet we see him stressing the

spiritual rule of God in the heart. We discover him busy in seeking to heal the schism in the Corinthian Church and emphasizing the unity that is in Christ, and at the same time we have the hypothesis of an antagonistic Pauline and Petrine party in the early Church. We have the development theory of St. Paul, which traces his gradual advance in thought from the simple statements of the Thessalonian Epistles through Galatians, Romans, Corinthians to the full cosmic significance of Christ as set forth in Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians. It is obvious that all these conflicting accounts cannot be true of one and the same individual. Many of them are mutually exclusive, and it is just possible that the modern disparagement of the apostle may be due, not to defects in the personality of St. Paul himself, but to the coloured, imperfect lenses through which the historical critic has observed him.

The forensic interpretation of the Cross of Jesus, as we find it in the Epistle to the Romans, has perhaps done more than anything else to antagonize the modern mind to the theological position of St. Paul. We prefer to explain God's dealings with men in categories of personal relationship, rather than those of law. We feel Christ's doctrine of the Fatherhood of God to be more vital and persuasive than any artificial simile drawn from courts of justice, and because it cannot be denied that a legalistic conception of the Cross is found upon the pages of the Roman epistle, the cry, 'Back to Christ,' seems to be justified. Yet we must not hold the apostle responsible for the more rigid forensic turn his thought has received from later theologians. From his Jewish upbringing, from the peculiarity and intensity of his spiritual experience, and from the fact that his great forensic epistle, that to the Romans, was not in its original form addressed to any Gentile church, but was an attempt to substantiate the claims of Jesus to his own people with their legalistic conception of God, it was perhaps inevitable that this epistle should have been forensic in form. But if its form be legalistic, its spirit is surely that of devoted filial love. One cannot read that great chapter, the eighth of Romans, without feeling that the forensic form of the epistle is more superficial and accidental than real and fundamental. 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God. For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the

spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him. . . . For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

We may feel that the categories which Paul drew from the sphere of law to describe man's relationship to God are altogether inadequate, but the indisputable fact which Paul sought to express by his doctrine of justification by faith still stands sure. We may prefer to use categories of personal relationship rather than those of law to give expression to the experience, but it remains true that the salvation of man is the eternal purpose, and springs out of the free grace of God. And this is Paul's gospel.

The Jewish idea of man's relationship to God was fundamentally forensic. Obligation and recompense were the two main thoughts which underlay their legal system. Salvation to the Jew was conditional upon man's merits and achievements. Paul's teaching was declared to be defective by those Jews who came down into Galatia, simply because they missed the familiar elements of obligation and recompense from it. His free spiritual religion savoured too much of filial trust to suit their legalistic notions, and they declared to Paul's Galatian converts that the doing of the works of the law was absolutely necessary for their salvation. In that fiery polemic epistle addressed to the Church in Galatia, Paul sought to save his disciples from being led astray by such legalistic exponents of religion. Immediately after the despatch of that angry letter to the Galatians, the apostle recast his argument to that church into a more conciliatory form likely to impress the council at Jerusalem which was to meet in a few days. We have identified the substance of his plea at Jerusalem with the first eleven chapters of the Roman epistle. The forensic form of his argument not only suits the audience to which it was addressed, but gives an interpretation of Paul's own spiritual experience. The apostle had awakened to the fact that he was morally bankrupt before God. He had failed to discharge his

full debt to the law, and as the wages of sin is death, he felt himself to be in a state of misery and wretchedness. But what if some one discharged man's debt to the law, then it must follow that man would be free of any obligation to the law. The apostle is reasoning in categories of law. He is thinking of a civil action for debt in which some friend comes forward and pays the claim owing, and thereby frees the debtor from all further obligation to his former creditor. And is this not exactly what Jesus must have done? The fact that He lived, and that the wages of sin is death, surely established logically that He had been without sin. But He had died, and if He who was sinless had paid the price of death, it must have been for another. Jesus had squared man's account with the law, which man himself could not pay. And therefore He had freed man from the penalty of the law. He had made ample restitution on behalf of man, and consequently no longer was it necessary for man to bring sin offerings and the other ever inadequate but now profitless requirements of the Mosaic ceremonial law. The apostle, who had thought himself to be the object of divine wrath and had cried out in his misery, 'O wretched man that I am,' now knew himself to be the object of divine love, 'being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith by his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God.'

The parables of Jesus, which so beautifully illustrate the teaching of the Master, have sometimes been used to establish wrong doctrinal positions when unimportant details of the story have been unduly stressed. And is this not what has happened with the simile which Paul has drawn from the court of law? He is contrasting the misery of the bankrupt with the joy which he experiences when he discovers that some friend has come and discharged his liabilities. The sole point of his argument is the exposition of God's free grace, the exhibition of that wonderful redeeming love which commendeth itself to us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. How lamentable it is that this attempt to elucidate the free grace and merciful kindness of our God has been construed by the Church to represent the heavenly Father of Jesus as a stern implacable

creditor who must have the last cent, and whose cruel vindictiveness could be appeased only by the terrible sacrifice of the Cross. What Paul must have suffered could he have foreseen the awful travesty which later generations made of his grand doctrine of grace! What needless fears and sufferings have tortured the souls of men, because of this unfortunate misrepresentation of the meaning of the apostle! If there be any suggestion at all of a hard creditor in Paul's thought, it is surely to the effect that this harsh idea latent in Judaism has for ever been banished by the full revelation of the love of God as manifested in the Cross of Christ.

Nor is it fair to seek to fasten any part of the blame for this sad caricature of God upon the Apostle Paul. The apostle is careful to guard himself against the interpretation his words have received in the creeds of Christendom. He expressly identifies both God and Christ in the work of reconciliation. "Who," he asks, "shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' And in that verse which mentions the necessity of propitiation, according to the usual rendering, Paul makes it clear that it is God Himself who sets forth Christ to be a propitiation. Moreover, it is extremely probable that, if these first eleven chapters of Romans be the substance of Paul's plea at Jerusalem, *ἱλαστήριον* should have the connotation of 'lid of the ark' or 'mercy seat' which it has in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament. This rendering removes entirely the ethical difficulty which the word 'propitiation' has for the modern mind. St. Paul is so far from setting any limit to the love of God, that in Ro 11²² he startles even his own self by reaching the bold conjecture that the universal salvation of all men may be the consummation of God's eternal purpose. The apostle's consummate skill in handling his case before the council wins for the Gentiles their entire freedom from the Jewish ceremonial code. They are only asked to observe three regulations, which are purely ethical, namely, that they should abstain from idols, from fornication, and from blood, *i.e.* murder.

Thus the forensic form which Paul gives to his interpretation of the Cross, when seen in its proper

historical setting, has nothing in it to disturb the susceptibilities of the modern mind. If he had been merely a professional theologian writing in the calm seclusion of the study, probably he would have found other and more adequate categories in which to express his thought. But the exigencies and needs of the early Christian Church made Paul a statesman rather than a theologian. The missionary organization of the Church delineated as the sphere of his activity the field of action rather than that of thought. To regard Paul's forensic interpretation of the Cross as the last word of the apostle upon the Atonement is to do him a great injustice. It was no integral part of Paul's theological system, but it was a piece of special pleading before a definite judicial tribunal. And it stands brilliantly justified in history in that it won freedom for the new religious body. It

saved the early Christian society from degenerating into a Jewish sect, and made out of it the Church Catholic. If later theologians have taken an incidental argument of the apostle, and made it the keystone of Church doctrine, let us attribute their action to their ignorance of the true historical setting, which gave the interpretation of the Cross its forensic form. The marrow of Paul's theology is to be found not in the legalistic form of the epistle, but in the ascriptions of praise which everywhere abound. 'God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' To Paul as to Jesus, God was no stern relentless creditor or judge, but the loving, forgiving, heavenly Father, who delighteth to see in His children no spirit of bondage unto fear, but that filial trust which can look up with confidence into His face and say, 'Abba, Father.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

An Anti-Semitic Wave and a Breakwater.¹

THE veteran Professor of Theology in Berlin University is to be warmly congratulated on the re-issue, in his seventy-third year, of his Introduction to the Talmud. It is thoroughly revised, largely re-written, and appears with the valuable addition of an equally good Introduction to the Midrash. He remarks in the Preface that, in his work he has never yet known an eight-hours day. The labour expended on this volume alone, not to speak of the many other tasks which have concurrently claimed his attention, is ample proof thereof. This book is not one that can be evolved out of one's 'inner consciousness.' It is one of the kind in which practically every statement must be proved by detailed references to authorities, and in which a very small paragraph represents the fruit of much research and patient plodding through a mass of what, to the most of us, is a little-known literature. This latest edition is the

outcome of long years of such arduous study. Strack himself does not claim that the account is yet complete, but he does claim that, so far as it goes, it is accurate. Twelve years intervene between the last edition and the present. In the interval considerable store of new material had accumulated. To all this full consideration is given.

Readers of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS know the value of the Talmud as a source of light on not a few problems of Christian scholarship. The relations of the earliest Christianity to its contemporary Judaism are important. We therefore welcome Strack's announcement, and eagerly await the appearance of his *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midraš*, on which, for many years, he has been busy in collaboration with P. Billerbeck.

In the present volume we have all the information about Talmud and Midrash which a scholar requires—the history told concisely, the contents of the various Tractates summarized, an account of the notable Scribes, in short every question that can be asked is here sufficiently answered. Before setting forth what the Talmud really contains, Strack deals with the oft-repeated assertion that the Jews were strictly forbidden to commit

¹ *Einleitung in Talmud und Midraš* (5te ganz neubearbeit. Aufl. d. *Einleitung in den Talmud*), pp. xii + 233. H. L. Strack. München, 1920.

Jüdische Geheimgesetze? 7te vermehrte u. verbesserte Aufl. Broch., pp. 39 + 2. H. L. Strack. Berlin, 1921.

the oral tradition to writing. He shows that in some cases the assertion is boldly made without real proof being even attempted. Where such a prohibition can be clearly traced, he points out that it could not have been a 'law' which was always and everywhere regarded as binding. For the traditions were all the time being written down. Of the prohibition the Jews themselves give diverse explanations, some of them curious enough. In all probability, in so far as it existed at all, the prohibition was meant to induce caution in writing and disseminating, as authoritative, decisions on matters which were still in process of discussion and only on their way to command general agreement. If we wonder that at certain periods so little was actually written, we may find a simple explanation in the probable scarcity of writers of adequate literary ability, and in the costliness of parchment.

The book is not only an absolutely trustworthy guide to the Talmud. It serves at the same time, as we indicate in our title, an apologetic purpose. The Talmud is a work of which every one knows that it exists, but most have very hazy notions as to what it contains. The mischief on the Continent has been, that the less the real knowledge of some people, the greater the assurance with which they have proclaimed that the Talmud contains some very terrible secret laws which the Jews at times put in practice. On the one hand, they emphasize the stringency and the success with which the Jews have kept their 'secret.' On the other hand, they are cock-sure that it has been given to them to discover what the secret is. This alleged knowledge of theirs is a weapon of the Anti-Semites.

Anti-Semitic feeling in the continental sense is almost unknown in Britain. Since the War, to be sure, we do find traces of a sharpened prejudice which brings Judaism and Bolshevism into close connexion, and vaguely accuses Jews of playing a sinister part as a 'hidden hand' in our policy during the War and since the Armistice. But, so far, it cannot be said that we have an anti-Semitic movement. That Anti-Semitism is strong on the Continent every schoolboy knows. It was the real explanation of the intense bitterness of the Anti-Dreyfusards in France. It led to pogroms in Russia. The peculiar German form which it took in the nineties, and still to some extent retains, is dealt with by Strack. There it based itself on the

alleged Jewish 'secret' to which we have referred. The Talmud was held to sanction and to inculcate, among other dreadful things, the undermining of Gentile States and the rite of offering in the Synagogue Gentile blood. By articles in the press and freely distributed tracts a state akin to panic was created in wide circles. Stringent investigation of Jewish school and other books, and of Jewish teaching in general, was demanded in several local parliaments. The investigation was carried out. Government Committees reported that absolutely no trace of Anti-Gentilism or any Jewish 'secret' could be discovered. Overwhelming majorities negated Anti-Semitic interpellations. Still the campaign of malignity, using now vague insinuation, now bold assertion, went on. That it is still a force may be gathered from the re-issue last year of Strack's exposure of the baselessness of charges which rest on nothing better than ignorance and stupidity posing as knowledge. With his own unrivalled knowledge of Jewish literature, in which department only a few Jews can match him, he has no difficulty in showing up the 'secret.' There is no such thing. There never was. If the Jews had ever had a secret law they could by no possibility have kept it a secret. He then goes on to show what a disastrous blunder it will be if Germany ever attempts to deny to the Jews full and free rights of citizenship.

The best way of allaying the fears and suspicions of the uninstructed as to the contents of the Talmud is to show plainly what they are, and this is fully and in brief compass done in his *Einleitung*.

It would be too much to hope that his unanswerable pamphlet against one type of argument will destroy Anti-Semitism in Germany or elsewhere. The Jew remains a problem. So virile and clever a race, with so little of vital religion, is a somewhat disturbing phenomenon, and Anti-Semitism will always appear to some to be a facile solution of the difficulty. But this particular form of it is henceforward impossible save to that prejudice to which all arguments are useful. The wide circulation of Strack's brochure, however, should do much to rob such blatant ignorance of an audience. Against this wave of ignorance posing as knowledge, he has thrown out an invincible breakwater.

French Commentaries.

THE Librairie Victor Lecoffre of Paris is issuing *Études Bibliques* of noteworthy excellence. We have received two Commentaries. One on the *Apocalypse* we reserve for future notice. The other is on *Jeremiah*, by Father Condamini, S.J. (pp. xlv + 389. Paris, 1920). These *Études* suggest one or two remarks. In the first place, they prove that there is a French theological literature of an order which is scarcely realized in this country. German influence was such that France was overlooked. Many years ago Royce said the same of French philosophy, and Bergson sprang into fame to justify him. These *Études* cannot be overlooked.

Another interesting thing is this. These *Études* are by Roman Catholics, and two points 'spring to the eye.' One has already been mentioned in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and these volumes confirm it markedly, viz. that Roman Catholic writers seem to be taking the traditional view of Protestants regarding the Scriptures as the 'inspired Word of God'—the full-bodied old doctrine, of which many Protestants are becoming dubious. The second is that these Catholic scholars show a remarkable catholicity of scholarship which fills us with rejoicing. Every Protestant work of any importance is not only mentioned but very fairly estimated. There is no trace here of the view, apparently in favour in some Anglo-Catholic circles, that everything worth attention on the Scriptures was said by the Fathers. Father Condamini has written an excellent Commentary on *Jeremiah* and gives what seems to us to be an admirable Translation. In the Introduction he is on the more conservative side. He has probably not been altogether able to keep a slight tincture of war-feeling against the Germans in general from sharpening his views of critics like Duhm in particular. Discounting that, we are at one with Condamini when he warns against the tendency of some critics to measure the objective truth of things by their own predilections, and to utter their opinions as the unassailable results of Science.

The text of *Jeremiah* as we have it does need emendation. Condamini fully acknowledges that, but aims at showing how little drastic change is really necessary. The divergences of LXX from the Massoretic text—in particular its omissions—

are very ably discussed. This is decidedly a Commentary to get and to read concurrently with Duhm.

In a Murtle Lecture recently delivered in Aberdeen, complaint was made that we had no history of Prayer. But there is one, and a very good one. It is by F. Heiler, D.Phil., Lecturer on the Science of Religion in the University of Munich (*Das Gebet: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche u. religionspsychologische Untersuchung*. 2te vermehrte u. verbesserte Aufl., pp. xix + 558. München, 1920).

Down to a comparatively recent period, Prayer, which in some shape or form is the universal—the sole universal—expression of Religion, has been, the author remarks, strangely neglected as a subject of scientific investigation.

'Even so brilliant a work as Robertson Smith's monograph on *The Religion of the Semites*, which broke out a new path in the study of Sacrifice, devotes no chapter to Prayer. In a detailed index there is no heading "Prayer."'

Yet the literature on Prayer is enormous. It takes seven closely printed small-type pages of the volume before us to name the material worth consultation.

It is testimony alike to the felt need of such a book and to the merit of this one that a second edition was in these times called for within two years. The author's knowledge of the subject is encyclopædic. He tells us what Prayer is all the world over, in every stage of culture. He shows how it developed from a naïve cry for divine assistance in some pressing need into the many-sided phenomenon which it presents in, e.g., Christian public worship. To begin with, Prayer is not, as some hold, an attempt to command Nature; it is an appeal out of a sense of weakness for supernatural aid, and all through the essence of Prayer has been a speaking to or communion with God. The author is not here concerned with the doctrine of Prayer which deals with such problems as its objective efficacy. His questions are what do we find Prayer to be, what is its significance, and what its place and efficacy in the spiritual life of man?

We are glad to see a new corrected and enlarged edition of Dalman's account of sites and scenes in the Holy Land (*Orte und Wege Jesu*, pp. 321. Gutersloh, 1921). It is a fine volume,

pleasant to handle and read, well printed on good paper—a scarce commodity in these days—and embellished with forty photogravures and plans. It is the fruit of thirteen years' sojourn and constant travelling among the places described. The phraseology is crisp, and the work proves, what we have sometimes been tempted to doubt, that a German *savant* can be a master of style. One feature that makes the book very interesting is the careful collating and criticism of traditional lore concerning the various sites. Dalman is justly suspicious of many of the mediæval 'traditions,' remarking that often they are not worth the name. He holds, however, that any site marked by an ancient 'native' Church is likely to be authentic. He is on doubtful ground, we think, when he almost takes it for granted that down to Constantine's time there survived a remembrance of the site of Golgotha.

What is the value to the Christian of the study of the topography of Palestine? Dalman holds that it is no small one. It deepens the impression of the reality of the Gospel narrative. It is good to feel assured that the story of Jesus was staged on the solid earth, that we are dealing with a chapter of actual world-history; and to move among the places frequented by Jesus mightily confirms faith in the historicity of His story. Dalman has put those who cannot view the Land of Jesus with their own eyes under a debt of gratitude for a description which brings the scenes so vividly before the mind.

The *Palästina-jahrbuch* (Berlin, 1921) opens with a somewhat pathetic article by Dalman, 'What concern of ours is Palestine?' in which he traces the history of German intercourse with Palestine, and laments that the Holy Land, where the German had come to be so much at home and where the traveller could sleep every night 'in a good German house,' is now out of German influence. To that question, of course, there are two sides. Apart from this it contains good examples of the value of the work of the German Evangelical Archæological Institute in Jerusalem, in papers by Dalman on the Golgotha Site and the Tobia Inscription;

van Berchem on Arabic Inscriptions from Jerusalem; and Möller on a five days' Trip to the Jordan Valley.

In what may be called the Dutch counterpart of our Cambridge Bible for Schools, the *Acts* has been done by Professor de Zwaan of Groningen (*De Handelingen der Apostelen*, pp. 164. Groningen, 1920). It consists of Introduction, a new Translation, and a Commentary. The scholarly and concise Commentary may be criticised here and there for the very fault that Dr. Zwaan finds in Luke—a disproportionate handling of some topics. Introduction to Acts is a storm-centre of controversy, and in the space at his disposal the author has not room to deal adequately with such a question as the date, and is compelled to state simply his own views with an appearance of dogmatism which we do not believe is real. He takes *cir.* 110 A.D. as the time of publication, though he allows the sources to be half a century older. Explanation of this long delay and of the abrupt closing of the narrative is scarcely attempted. But surely the latter point is a crucial one. The summary of views as to the purpose of Acts is excellent.

It has long been known that there are inscriptions in Sinai. At one time they were held to be memorials of Israel's wanderings. As nobody could read the writing, that view was just as good as any. In recent years, however, considerable progress has been made in their decipherment. It is an interesting story, and Robert Eisler tells it well and makes his own notable contribution (*Die Kenitischen Weihinschriften der Hyksozeit*, pp. viii + 179. Freiburg, 1919). Light is cast on the evolution of the alphabet and on the cultural and other relationships of these tribes who appear sometimes as individuals in the Old Testament. Minor points of interest abound sometimes in the footnotes. Midian, we find, was not a tribe but a guild. Hobab is not a proper noun, but an old word for Father-in-law. Jethro is perhaps a title, and so on.

W. D. NIVEN.

Contributions and Comments.

Gideon and his Three Hundred (Judg. vii. 5, 6).

IN an interesting note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1921 (vol. xxxiii. p. 93), the Rev. Harry Smith of Old Kilpatrick draws attention to the very variant meanings which have been put into these two verses, and the shifts to which the critics have put themselves in order to get any consistent sense out of them. There is one point, however, which has apparently escaped their notice, and that is that the word *kara*, 'to bow down,' means strictly 'to drink by putting the mouth in the water,' as cattle do. The text states that three hundred lifted the water to their mouths in their hands, and lapped it as a dog laps, whilst the rest went down on their hands and knees, and drank, putting their mouths in the water, as, for example, a horse does. The story is quite plain. There are no 'glosses' or redactors or emendations required.

The critics are also puzzled to know to what 'water' it was that Gideon brought his men down. The answer is that it was rain-water, which had collected in pools. This also is implied in the word used.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow University.

Paul's Religion—Whence was it?

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (Feb. 1922, p. 204) the real source of Paul's religion is not stated; but he tells us himself. Ten times he says it was by 'Revelation.' What did he mean?

St. Paul was converted to become a Christian by Christ revealing Himself by word of mouth on the road to Damascus. Within a few days he was ready to be baptized as a Christian.

He could not return to Jerusalem, so goes to Arabia (Gal 1¹⁷). How long he was there under the tuition of Jesus Christ, we do not know; but on his return he is not only fully equipped, but eager to preach 'My' Gospel, as he calls it, to the Gentiles.

He wrote to the Corinthians: 'If I come

again, I will not spare, seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me' (2 Co 13^{2f}).

So, God the Father was *in* Jesus, the Carpenter's son; as St. Paul asserts, 'God was *in* Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself . . . and committed unto us the word of reconciliation.'

Thus a spirit wrote through Rev. G. Vale Owen's hand: 'The Christ was One with the Father, and being One with the Father, was of the Father's selfhood. Jesus of Nazareth was the expression of the thoughts of the Father incarnated, as the Christ, for earth's salvation' (*Weekly Dispatch*, Dec. 18th, 1921).

GEORGE HENSLOW.

Bournemouth.

The Parable of the Hidden Treasure, and of the Pearl Merchant (Matt. xiii. 44 ff.).

I HAVE never yet seen an exposition of these two little pictures that was as convincing as I should like; and the reason is that they have usually been taken as referring to two differing experiences—either the soul finds God after a long and arduous search, or God in His goodness reveals Himself to the soul—even while it is concerned with matters entirely foreign to Him. I find it difficult to believe that was the intention of Jesus. It invites the dangerous conclusion that indolence on our part does not greatly matter. If we are not prepared to seek, yet the truth will force itself upon us, while we are unambitiously going about the work of our farm.

My suggestion is that the two parables refer to the two sides of one and the same experience. The Spirit of God does break into the life of man in a thousand small and apparently accidental ways. But that happens—and can happen—only when men are very concerned that God should reveal Himself. The apparent accident is not an accident at all. That is a principle that may be noticed in things both small and great, and perhaps the smallest example may be recognized most easily. A friend wrote me some time ago that my

remarks 'brought home an incident which happened in the office here on Saturday last, and bears out your own conclusions. An important document required for a pending lawsuit was missing on Friday, and had been for some time. I told the clerk it must be found by Saturday at the latest. Next morning it was there on my arrival. When I asked for an explanation the girl said, "I was worrying about it so much last night that when I went to bed I dreamed about it, and in my dream went to a certain book and found it. When I came to the office I went straight to the book, and there it was." Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES do not need to be reminded that is neither miracle nor accident. It was a revival of memory—a quickening of intellectual power—through emotional stress.

Jesus loved men to be serious; He loved men to be eager to understand the ways of God and to enjoy His gifts. He wished them to feel that God is so precious to human life that everything else can be surrendered in the search for God. And if a man be serious and determined as that, then God is able to disclose Himself—not in great and dramatic upheavals of life, but in a thousand gentle, small, and seemingly accidental ways. The great thing is—never to refuse the valuable gift because it is in an undistinguished setting. At the first turn of the road we may run into the arms of God Himself; but we shall not recognize Him unless we are the kind of men who have trained themselves to recognize Him. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a merchantman seeking goodly pearls; he is ready to go to the ends of the earth in search of the best. But he has gained, by his continual self-discipline, so sound an instinct for the beautiful that even the caked and common clay cannot hide from him the value of what is accidentally uncovered in his own field. S. TONKIN.

Ilkley.

Divergences between the Peshitta and the Sinai Syriac Accounts of Jesus' Reception of the Children.

THE Syriac version of the Gospels discovered by Mrs. Lewis, and now distinguished by the letters SS, shows certain remarkable divergences in

Mk 10¹³⁻¹⁶ from the readings in the Peshitta and the Textus Receptus.

In v.¹³ TR has *ἵνα ἅψῃται αὐτῶν* and SP has *dn(e)krub lhun*, for which the RV gives 'that he should touch them.' Instead of this phrase SS has *dnsm aidh alihun*, 'that he should lay his hand upon them.'

Then at v.¹⁶ TR has *ἐναγκαλισάμενος*, represented in SP by *shkal anun al drav(h)i* and rendered in RV 'he took them in his arms.' Instead of this reading SS has *kra anun* '(he) called them (to him).'

The questions arise: (1) Which of the readings is true to the original text? and (2) How did the divergence come about?

One index as to the original text is found by a comparison with the parallel passages in Mt. and Lk., accepting the view that both of these were indebted to Mark for the substance of this particular incident. Corresponding to the word *ἅψῃται* in Mk 10¹³ in TR, Mt 19¹³ has, in SP and SS, 'that he should lay his hand upon them and pray,' while Lk 18¹⁵ has in SP 'that he should touch them,' but in SS 'that he should lay his hand upon them'—the same words exactly as in SS, Mk 10¹³.

In the parallel passages to v.¹⁶ neither Mt. nor Lk. in SS has an equivalent of *ἐναγκαλισάμενος* of TR with its corresponding expression in SP 'took them up in his arms' (AV), but in SP Lk. has *ἵς, kra*, the equivalent of *προσκαλεσάμενος*.

It would seem that the parallel passages in Mt. and Lk. indicate that SS is closer to the original than TR and SP. The story according to SS suggests that the children were not quite infants, but of an age perhaps up to ten or twelve, and that the parents desired Jesus not merely to touch them, but to place His hand solemnly upon their head and bless them, or, as Mt. puts it, *pray*. It suggests also that, while they were standing a little distance off, Jesus called them to come forward and then, as had been desired, put His hand upon their heads and blessed them.

The divergent readings in v.¹³ may perhaps be accounted for if *ἅψεσθαι* be regarded as translatable into Syriac optionally either 'to touch' or 'to lay hands upon.' But the reason for the divergence in v.¹⁶ seems to be that, while *προσκαλεσάμενος* was the word in the original Gk. text, an early transcriber inadvertently substituted for it *ἐναγκα-*

λιόσμενος. The same kind of error might account for the occurrence of ἐναγκαλισάμενος in TR Mk 9⁸⁶ (represented in SS by ܣܕ ܒܗ, *chr bh* '(he) looked on him'). The word occurs in the NT only in Mk 9⁸⁶ and Mk 10¹⁶. It seems unnecessary that Jesus should take a number of children up one by one in His arms, especially if not infants, and while embracing them place His hand on their heads individually, although we cherish the thought of Christ's tenderness implied in such action.

While lacking this tender touch, according to SS the narrative is self-consistent throughout. Jesus calls the children near to Him. They are old enough to respond. Then, with both hands laid upon their heads He blesses them, apparently two at a time, as Jacob did the children of Joseph.

J. MATHEW.

Coburg, Victoria, Australia.

Peshitta Syriac N.T.

MR. ALBERT BONUS, in his appreciative letter published in your last issue, calls attention to the reading of He 2¹⁶, in the Bible Society's new edition of the Peshitta Syriac N.T., and seeks information as to the authorities consulted for this edition. As stated in my preface, the text of the Gospels is that prepared by the late Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, as issued (with a full critical apparatus) by the Clarendon Press in 1901. The text of Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Pauline Epistles (including Hebrews) follows a critical revision prepared by Mr. Gwilliam on lines similar to his earlier work on the Gospels; this was completed by the late Rev. John Pinkerton, that brilliant Oriental scholar who fell in the trenches on the Salonica front. I also mentioned in the preface that Mr. Pinkerton assisted Mr. Gwilliam in the collation of the Peshitta manuscripts at the British Museum. The remainder of the N.T. text is taken by permission from Dr. Gwynn's editions of the Four Minor Epistles (1909) and Revelation (1897).

As Mr. Bonus rightly says, it did not fall within the Society's intention to indicate the MS. authorities more precisely. It may interest him and others to know that all the important Peshitta MSS. at the British Museum were examined by both Mr. Gwilliam and Mr. Pinkerton. In particular, Mr. Gwilliam collated for Acts and the Catholic Epistles, B.M. Add. 14,473 (fully), and

for Acts only B.M. Add. 14,472 and Add. 14,470 (partially). Mr. Pinkerton informed me that for the Pauline Epistles he had himself fully collated three of the B.M. MSS. and constantly consulted two others on all important variants. Unfortunately he did not specify these MSS. He also used 'the collation of a Bodleian MS. by A. Guillaume' for the Pauline Epistles and Acts and Catholic Epistles; and a partial collation by P. E. Pusey of 'a MS. not yet identified,' for Acts and the Catholic Epistles. For Acts, Mr. Pinkerton made a specially full collation of the B.M. Add. 17,120 and Add. 17,121.

In addition, Mr. Pinkerton carefully collated an important MS. of the Peshitta N.T. in the John Rylands Library, Manchester (Rylands Cod. Syr. 2, c. A.D. 900); and also another important MS. of the Peshitta N.T. now in the Bible House Library (c. cent. X. or XI.). In a description of this Bible House Library MS., I find a note which states that 'it follows the Greek at He 2¹⁶.' Dr. Alphonse Mingana kindly informs me that the Rylands MS. also gives the reading of Widmanstadt. It is evident, therefore, that the authorities on which the editors of our edition based their reading at He 2¹⁶ were the MSS. to which Mr. Bonus refers.

R. KILGOUR.

Editorial Superintendent, B.F.B.S.

The Fourth Cry from the Cross.

BOTH Matthew and Mark record this word, and only this word, from the Cross; both give the Aramaic, and then its interpretation, though with slight variations. It is always taken for granted that our Lord was quoting the 22nd Psalm. St. Matthew brings the word 'Eli' closer to the Hebrew than St. Mark's 'Eloi'; and St. Mark brings the whole of the interpretation closer to the Greek (LXX) of the Psalm. But *neither* of them represents our Lord as quoting the Psalm, for σαββαθωνι stands for a quite different word. In the Psalm the word used is עֲבֹתָנִי (âzabthani, Azabthani).

(a) The Evangelists (or their informants) have jumped to the conclusion that our Lord was quoting the Psalm; and have so far imported into the cry an idea preconceived under the Psalm's influence. The Psalmist really felt, and could

with his limited idea of God believe, that God had turned away from Him.

(b) And so we have started from the same idea. Of course *if* our Lord said 'forsaken' in the sense which the word has for us, then we have to accept and interpret, in the best way we can, the fact that God *had* forsaken him.

But ἐγκατέλιπες need not necessarily bear that sense, even if the Evangelists intended it so; while σαβᾶθον need not imply (as ἀζαβᾶθον would) a deliberate leaving to trouble and misery. In Dn 4²² and elsewhere it is merely colourless = 'leave.'

I cannot think, with Plummer, that 'for an awful moment . . . even the love of the Father seemed to have been withdrawn from Him.' Any seeming other than reality has a subtle touch of Docetism. Nor can I apply Plummer's quotation from the Testament of Joseph, that . . . 'God departeth for a little space, to try the inclination of the soul.' . . . God did not need to try Jesus Christ, He saw plainly enough.

My own belief is that in attaining the perfection which was God's eternal purpose for man, there must come a moment when the creature is so complete in fulness of life that its real existence could be independent of God (as presumably Satan's is) and that our Lord, being progressively made perfect through suffering even as He hung on the Cross, reached that point in the darkness, and cried out in realizing that He had, as man, to make the last supreme choice between self-existence apart from God, and self-existence resigned into the Creator-Father's hands.

This is, however, far past the initial textual point. Will any one explain how the Cry can be a quotation from Ps 22, when the main word is different? And has not the suggestion that it is a quotation brought a preconception into the discussion of this supremely important text from which it would be well to clear our minds?

J. M. BALLARD.

Christ Church, Falkirk.

Entre Nous.

A TEXT.

Matt. xxiii. 8.

'The operation is finished, and in the hardly lighted dormitory I watch for the sick man's awaking. Scarcely has he recovered consciousness when he stares about him and ejaculates again and again: "I've no more pain! I've no more pain!" . . . His hand feels for mine and will not let it go. Then I begin to tell him and the others who are in the room that it is the Lord Jesus who has told the doctor and his wife to come to the Ogowe, and that white people in Europe give them the money to live here and cure the sick negroes. Then I have to answer questions as to who these white people are, where they live, and how they know that the natives suffer so much from sickness. The African sun is shining through the coffee bushes into the dark shed, but we, black and white, sit side by side, and feel that we know by experience the meaning of the words: "And all ye are brethren" (Matt. xxiii. 8). Would that

my generous friends in Europe could come out here and live through one such hour!'¹

SOME TOPICS.

The Rising Generation.

'So far as the rising generation is concerned, probably the happiest effect of prohibition will be that no new drunkards will be manufactured. The children will grow up without acquiring the taste for alcoholic drinks. A few old toppers of the present generation may be too far gone to mend their ways, and may, through indulgence in the deadly substitutes secretly sold by "bootleggers" in contravention of the law, get delirium tremens and die, but few young men are likely to acquire the liquor habit through drinking hair oil, or Jamaica Ginger, or Bay rum, or varnish or toilet water, or quinine tonic or any other of the sicken-

¹ A. Schweitzer, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, p. 93.

ing concoctions resorted to by the men who have become "pickled in alcohol" and are willing to drink anything to satisfy their depraved craving.¹

Dives and Lazarus.

'I gave up my position of professor in the University of Strasbourg, my literary work, and my organ-playing in order to go as a doctor to Equatorial Africa. How did that come about?

'I had read about the physical miseries of the natives in the virgin forests; I had heard about them from missionaries, and the more I thought about it the stranger it seemed to me that we Europeans trouble ourselves so little about the great humanitarian task which offers itself to us in far-off lands. The parable of Dives and Lazarus seemed to me to have been spoken directly of us! We are Dives, for, through the advances of medical science, we now know a great deal about disease and pain, and have innumerable means of fighting them; yet we take as a matter of course the incalculable advantages which this new wealth gives us! Out there in the colonies, however, sits wretched Lazarus, the coloured folk, who suffers from illness and pain just as much as we do, nay, much more, and has absolutely no means of fighting them. And just as Dives sinned against the poor man at his gate because for want of thought he never put himself in his place and let his heart and conscience tell him what he ought to do, so do we sin against the poor man at our gate.'²

Muhammadanism.

'Wherever the negro population has turned Mahommedan there is no progress, either socially or economically.'³

Blessing and Cursing.

"It is not all as it should be, even to-day," said to me an employee of a big trading firm, who was returning for a third period of work to his post in Africa. "We bring the negroes strong drink and diseases which were previously unknown

among them. Do the blessings we bring the natives really outweigh the evils that go with them?"⁴

The Blessing.

'As we mounted the hill through the rows of neat bamboo huts belonging to the negroes, the chapel doors opened after service. We were introduced to some of the congregation and had a dozen black hands to shake. What a contrast between these clean and decently clothed people and the blacks that we had seen in the seaports, the only kind of native we had met up to now! Even the faces are not the same. These had a free and yet modest look in them that cleared from my mind the haunting vision of sullen and unwilling subjection, mixed with insolence, which had hitherto looked at me out of the eyes of so many negroes.'⁵

The Curse.

'Now the voyage continues. On the banks are the ruins of abandoned huts. "When I came out here fifteen years ago," said a trader who stood near me, "these places were all flourishing villages." "And why are they so no longer?" I asked. He shrugged his shoulders and said in a low voice, "L'alcohol. . . ."⁶

Polygamy.

'The more developed the economic condition of a people becomes, the easier becomes the contest with polygamy. When men begin to live in permanent houses, and to practise the rearing of cattle, and agriculture, it disappears of itself because it is no longer demanded by their circumstances, and is no longer even consistent with them. Among the Israelites, as their civilization advanced, monogamy peacefully drove out polygamy. During the prophetic period they were both practised side by side; the teaching of Jesus does not even hint at the existence of the latter.'⁷

What Christianity Means.

'Christianity is for him the light that shines amid the darkness of his fears; it assures him that

¹ St. Nihal Singh, *'Dry' America*, p. 102.

² A. Schweitzer, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, p. 1 f.

³ *Ibid.* p. 15.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 18.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 25.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 21.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 127.

he is not in the power of nature-spirits, ancestral spirits, or fetishes, and that no human being has any sinister power over another, since the will of God really controls everything that goes on in the world.

"I lay in cruel bondage,
Thou cam'st and mad'st me free!"

These words from Paul Gerhardt's Advent hymn express better than any others what Christianity means for primitive man. That is again and again the thought that fills my mind when I take part in a service on a mission station.¹

The Book of Job.

The Rev. Buchanan Blake, D.D., has said his say on *The Meaning of Suffering in Human Life* (Paisley: Gardner; 6s.). So much has been said on it since the War began that novelty is out of the question. Yet Dr. Blake is an independent thinker, and after much that is familiar he does give us a note on the Book of Job that is fresh. He has said in his volume that there are five ways of interpreting the existence of pain in human life. These five ways he finds in Job.

'This Book has the following distinct divisions, each with its own explanation of suffering in the world.

- These are (1) The Prologue in prose.
(2) The Cycle of Speeches.
(3) The Voice out of the Storm.
(4) The Contention of Elihu.
(5) The Epilogue in prose.

And the following are the suggested explanations in order:

- (1) In the Speeches of the Friends that all suffering is penal, and thus a punishment for wrong-doing.
(2) In the Epilogue that suffering is for a time, and that it ends in the restoration of the righteous sufferer.
(3) In the Voice out of the Storm suffering is declared to be a mystery which man can never understand.

¹ A. Schweitzer, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, p. 154.

- (4) In the Prologue the contention of the writer is that suffering in the case of the innocent is a supreme Divine test.
(5) In the Contention of Elihu that suffering is a method of Divine discipline, and therefore remedial.'

The Joy of Venture.

'Travelling in Angola many years ago, a friend of mine went off the path to where a peculiar clicking and laughing noise was in progress. Looking over the steep bank of the Zambesi River, he saw a great crocodile with its body half out of the water looking eagerly up, with his mouth wide open, while at the end of the overhanging branch of a tree was a monkey who was playfully swinging down to the crocodile. Each time he reached the croc, snap went the great jaws, and back swung the monkey with screeches of laughter and chuckles of delight.'²

A Lion in the House.

'One night I had gone off to sleep and my cook and houseboy were sleeping by the fire in the middle of my room, when at 2 a.m. I was roused by an unearthly noise at the other end of the house, and my boys shouting: "A lion, Bwana, a lion in the house." I awoke and jumped out of bed, lit a candle, and the boys blew up the fire at which we sat crouching. The noises in the other room made us nervy. There were intervals of quiet, then the tramp and noise was resumed. It was pitch dark, the village was some distance away, and the brute could have climbed over the partition wall. I felt jumpy, and decided that the time for action had come, so grabbing my rifle I said to the cook, "I'll open the door and cover you with my rifle while you run to the village and call the men." I did so successfully, but the noise was renewed, so I decided to have a shot at the brute myself. "Goi," I said to my houseboy, "hold the lantern over my head and I will go out and shoot the lion myself." "Right, sir," he replied, so I opened the door and moved cautiously in the direction of the lion. I got there with nerves highly strung, and was ready to shoot the first thing that showed. To my surprise and

² D. Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantuland*, p. 290.

amusement the lion turned out to be a puppy-dog that had got its head inside an empty 4 lb. sugar tin, and couldn't get it out!'¹

NEW POETRY.

Beatrice Reed.

Beatrice Reed's *Pepper and Salt* (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net) is like, outwardly, to Rabindranath Tagore's poetry. Inwardly it is not so. There is more virility (if that can be attributed to a woman) and there is more rebelliousness. But we shall quote two very short paragraphs which are rather *obiter dicta* than direct message.

'Breeding is the capacity for perfect ease and naturalness under circumstances partly or wholly artificial. But it is born, not acquired.'

'Bitterness changed to sweetness, the rancour of human experience into gentleness, ingratitude into benefits, insults into pardon. My aim in life, just that. But the change must seem spontaneous and seek no credit.'

Leslie Hinchliff Winn.

If there is not a finer poem in *Quietude* (Cecil Palmer; 2s. 6d. net) by Leslie Hinchliff Winn than the prelude, there are other poems that are beautiful in thought and very melodious. 'The Jewel' is one, a sonnet on the wonder of an infant:

A treasure to behold and to embrace;
A charm that can away all sorrow chase.
A little babe, and all the world made sweet.

But the prelude is richer in religious feeling:

THE DARKNESS UNVEILS THEE.

Lord of my life! I find with inward eye
In vault above, and imaged in the sea,
Thy face. The wind is living breath from
Thee;

¹ D. Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantuland*, p. 288f.

Thy voice, the thunder and the deep wood's
sigh;

The clouds that with their beauty lace the sky
Are fringes of Thy trailing garmentry.

But they are veils; it is the mystery
Of night's uncurtained hours that brings Thee
nigh.

Thou art the God of love. My flesh may fear
When night dissolves what day has wrought
between,

So that I at Thy very throne appear,
My soul all seeing what no eye hath seen.
But though flesh tremble with Thy presence
near—

Lord of my life! on Thee my soul shall lean.

G. F. Bradby.

Mr. G. F. Bradby, unlike most versifiers, estimates his verses aright. 'I am aware,' he says, 'that what I have written has little, if any, literary merit.' But then the author of 'Hudibras' could have said that. And we should have been sorry if we had lost either 'Hudibras' or *The Way* (Milford; 1s. 6d. net). Here is one of the shortest of the pieces. They all touch on incidents in the Gospels:

'DO THIS.'

I give My body for your sake;
If needs must be,
Your bodies also you must break
In memory of Me.

I give My blood, in pain and bitter loss
You, too, must spill
Your life-blood, if I call you from the Cross
To do My Father's will.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.